

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. 439.—APRIL, 1914.

Art. 1.—BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY IN THE LAST CENTURY.

1. *The Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of Clarendon, K.G.* By the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart. Two vols. London: Arnold, 1913.
2. *Lord Lyons: A Record of British Diplomacy.* By Lord Newton. Two vols. London: Arnold, 1913.

A CENTURY has now elapsed since the termination of the Napoleonic Wars. For the best part of a generation the nations of Europe had been almost continually engaged in mortal strife; and the peace finally accomplished in 1815 opened for the world a new era. The Great Powers were impoverished and exhausted; and even for Great Britain, whose territory had never been overrun by the enemy, and who had stood foremost amongst the nations in the credit and renown of the final triumph, a period of internal distress and popular discontent was to elapse before anything like normal prosperity and a general sense of security in her domestic affairs were regained.

After Waterloo, a new period began in which Great Britain was to play a very different, but perhaps not less useful part on the stage of European politics. Fresh developments, new popular and national aspirations and rivalries arose; and ambitious monarchs and statesmen set before themselves new objects. In many quarters the spirit of autocracy and arbitrary power was strong and sought extension. On the other hand a desire for free government, an enthusiasm for nationality, a passion for democracy were at work—motives which, if they could get free play, were certain to change not

only the internal conditions of the various States, but also to modify their relations with each other.

Have British statesmen, throughout the past century, on the whole guided our national foreign policy in a spirit which commends itself to the sympathy and conscience of Englishmen of the present generation? Was their policy in the main successful? Has it, speaking generally and taking a wide survey of past events, given security and honour to our country and reflected credit on our statesmen and diplomatists? That very often blunders were committed, matters mismanaged, and great and unnecessary risks run, no one conversant with our modern history can doubt. Nevertheless, as time unfolds the full story of the past, as year by year the memoirs and letters of British statesmen throw light upon the facts, and on their own conduct and motives, the more reason have we to feel satisfied that in its foreign policy the ship of state has been steered in the right direction, and with more skill than over-exacting and partially informed contemporaries were willing to admit.

As regards some of the most important transactions of the period the two works named above form an interesting study. No men did better service in their own lines than Lord Clarendon and Lord Lyons; yet no two individuals ever differed more in the natural gifts, attainments and capacities which distinguished them—the one a brilliant statesman, the life of every social circle, popular with men and women, intimate with most of the Sovereigns and half the statesmen of Europe, and swaying the policy of his own country; the other a trained diplomatist, a bachelor holding himself aloof from general society, wholly absorbed in his profession, supremely anxious above all things to carry out precisely and to the letter the instructions he had received, a keen observer of passing events and of men, the instructor as to facts of Secretaries of State, but never for one moment fancying that he was more than an instrument to carry out the policy for which the Ministers of the day were alone responsible.

George Villiers, almost from his boyhood, felt a strong inclination to embark on a political career, especially if

it should bring him into close contact with foreign affairs. Educated in London at Christ's Hospital, he went in 1816 as a fellow-commoner to St John's College, Cambridge, where he seems to have shown an incapacity for mathematics and a thorough distaste for the ordinary studies of his University. For modern languages, on the other hand, he had a turn from his childhood; and we find him, while still a Johnian, practising his German and working with an Italian master. In 1820, when he had only just taken his degree, Lord Castlereagh started him in a diplomatic career by attaching him to the Embassy of Sir Charles Bagot at St Petersburg, where he spent nearly three years, returning with the permission of Canning, in accordance with the wish of himself and his relatives that he should seek public employment at home. His parents were poor, but they had interest with the prevailing powers; and young George Villiers was at once appointed to a Commissionership of Customs—a place providing him, no doubt, with a fixed income and a secure future, but not likely to satisfy the demands of his ambition or to afford due scope for his abilities. In 1831 the Whigs were in office. Lord Althorp sent him to Paris with Bowring to negotiate for the relaxation of some of the then existing obstructions to free commercial intercourse between England and France; and it was the report of George Villiers on this subject that first attracted public attention to his deserts, and secured him a future of public service. The Reform Bill agitation was then in full swing. Villiers was in favour of reform, though he disapproved the violence of language indulged in by many Whig statesmen at that exciting time. The General Election that followed the Reform Bill placed the Whigs in power, and to all appearance promised them a long spell of office. Palmerston, now Foreign Secretary, was a reformer of that exceedingly moderate type that recommended itself to young George Villiers, who received from him in September, 1839, the appointment of Minister to the Court of Queen Christina at Madrid. If the Tories had not done badly for him, the Whigs assuredly had done still better.

King Ferdinand of Spain died at the moment of the

arrival of Villiers at Madrid; and his infant daughter's claim to the throne was immediately disputed by her uncle Don Carlos. A very similar state of affairs existed in Portugal; and the British Government, in alliance, as they hoped, with France, sought to strengthen the cause of the two young Queens. Palmerston, always suspicious of the autocratic Powers of the North, brought into existence a Quadruple Alliance between Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal, which he hoped would favour the establishment of more liberal and constitutional systems of government in the Peninsula. It, however, very soon appeared that Louis Philippe was much less afraid of the reactionary tendencies of the Carlists than of the liberal aims of their opponents, who supported the government of the Regent, Queen Christina, Ferdinand's widow. Gradually France and England drew apart, and the *Entente Cordiale* which Palmerston believed he had accomplished rapidly melted away. Nothing could exceed the zeal with which Villiers acted on his instructions to support the Queen and constitutional government; though his experience in Spain soon convinced him that hardly any one in that country cared at all about the latter, that the immense majority of Spaniards were at heart Carlists, and that the people would be content to live under any king strong enough to govern justly and keep the peace. Spain was in fact rapidly approaching a condition of anarchy. The war between the supporters of the Queen and the Carlists was accompanied with incredible barbarities; and Villiers was anxious to become the means of putting an end to this 'cannibal war,' and at the same time of building up permanent relations between Spain and England, whereby each country should prove a source of wealth and strength to the other. He disapproved of half measures, of the 'Spanish Legion,' and of the restriction of British arms to naval operations; and he advised active intervention by the landing in Spain of a British army:

'I live,' he writes to his sister Theresa (Feb. 1836), 'in the midst of vice and intrigue: I have not, during two years, met with an honest man, tho' the most fulsome self-praise and sickening pretensions to virtue are what one is obliged to bolt without a wry face, every time one talks to a Spaniard. . . . A country in which the bounty of Heaven is perhaps

more visible than in any other [is] inutilised and disfigured by the hands of men.'

Still, he felt so deeply embarked in the cause and the country that he would not, if he could, leave Madrid for another post. 'The old women of Downing Street,' in spite of all he could say, 'refused to see that on the issue of this civil war much of the policy of Europe must turn.' 'Downing Street,' or Palmerston, however, remained unmoved, and refused without the co-operation of France armed intervention in the internal affairs of Spain. Assuredly there were abundant precedents in history to justify the caution of Ministers at home in declining to follow the advice of 'the man on the spot,' and to send a British army to assist the cause of Christina. It would, for one thing, 'deprive that cause of its nationality,' said 'Downing Street'—a reply which, though George Villiers in a letter to his brother pours scorn upon it, has evidently no little force.

Disgusted as he was with much that surrounded him, there were other considerations which in his eyes made his post at Madrid a desirable one:

'Spain,' he writes, in the letter to his sister above quoted, 'is a school for learning diplomacy founded upon the study of man—quite unique. I am convinced that I have improved more in *my profession* during two years here than I should in 20 as Ambassador at Paris. The theatre is small, but *there* is enacted, in all possible variety, every passion which can move the human mind. . . . What practical lessons are to be learned here of the importance of energy and decision—how thoro'ly versed I feel in all the evils which an absence of moral principle can entail upon a nation, and the endless forms of misery which proceed from misgovernment! Loathsome studies I admit; but to be a good surgeon, one must dissect many bodies.'

As Villiers was to remain four years and a half at Madrid, he had ample time to prosecute these studies. He could not compose civil strife in Spain, but he had the satisfaction, before he came home, of seeing the war brought to an end by the complete defeat of the Carlists. He had skilfully and successfully negotiated with Spain a Slave Trade Treaty and a new commercial arrangement, which, in gaining a more favourable position for

British trade, helped with other things to excite the jealousy and ill-humour of France. Palmerston even then foresaw that France would endeavour to win influence and ascendancy in Spain by means of those very matrimonial projects which a few years later were to bring Great Britain and France to the verge of war. Villiers did not much believe in the justice of Palmerston's suspicions; but, as was apt to be the case, time showed that Palmerston was right; and Villiers was in cordial agreement with his chief as to the necessity of defeating these intentions, if they existed. In 1839 he was welcomed home by Ministers warmly appreciative of the great ability with which he had conducted his mission, and anxious, as soon as an opportunity could be found, to make further use of his services. Shortly afterwards, by the death of his uncle the third Earl of Clarendon, he succeeded to the title.

The Villiers family, of which he was now head, was remarkable for the strong affection that united its members, and for the exceptional charm and ability by which many of them were distinguished. Sir Henry Taylor, in one of the most delightful of autobiographies, has described the members of that little group of intellectuals to which his younger brothers, Charles and Hyde, belonged.

The 'breakfasts prolonged from ten to three by the charm of Charles Austin's bold and buoyant vivacities, set off by the gentle and thoughtful precision of John Romilly, the searching insight of John Mill, the steady and sterling sense of Edward Strutt, the gibes and mockeries of Charles Villiers, and the almost feminine grace combined with the masculine intellect of Hyde' (Vol. I, pp. 159-60).

The elder brother, George, at twenty-six, 'was gay, graceful, brilliant and pre-eminently popular; and Charles * with still more wit than George (who, however, had not a little) was sarcastic and unpopular.' With the youngest brothers, Hyde and Edward, Taylor's friendship was the closest; while to the charms of their only and much-loved sister (afterwards Mrs Lister and Lady Theresa Lewis) Taylor soon fell a victim. In a

* Charles Villiers was a member of several Ministries and was M.P. for Wolverhampton from 1835 to 1898.

few paragraphs of the Autobiography,* written in 1865 while she was still alive, her character is drawn and her story told in language both of insight and of feeling, as unlike as anything could well be to 'the dry botanical dissection of a dead flower' to which it has pleased Sir Herbert Maxwell to liken them.

Mrs Villiers, the mother, made a home for her family at Kent House (long ago demolished), which she shared with her sister-in-law Lady Morley, herself one of the most brilliant and at the same time most easy and natural of the London ladies of her day. 'Mrs Villiers,' says Henry Taylor, 'was a woman of the world, and, with the exception perhaps of Lady Charlotte Lindsay, the wittiest woman of her time; but with all that she was simple, kindly, brave and strong'—a description of her confirmed by the clever letters to her sons which, perhaps in excessive abundance, Sir Herbert has showered upon us in these volumes.

To some readers, whose interest in the politics of the past is slight, the frequent glimpses of social life and the sidelights thrown on the personality of contemporaries in these letters between near relatives and intimate friends, will prove more attractive than other details, which in the view of history are more important. Another lively correspondent of Lord Clarendon, from his early days downwards, was Miss Emily Eden, daughter of the first Lord Auckland, and sister to that Eleanor Eden who made conquest of the not very susceptible heart of Pitt. Writing in 1834 from Bowood, where she had been spending a fortnight with her brother, she says:

'The house was full of people and we enjoyed ourselves amazingly. It is always rather superior society in point of talk; there is less said about people, and more about books than in most country houses; and there were besides Barringtons, Nortons, Kennedys, Lord John Russell, etc., a floating capital of poets and travellers who furnished us with a little information. There was a Mr Burnes† who has been from Delhi through the Cabul and Bukhara to Ispahan by routes which no European has travelled before, and he gave us his

* Sir H. Taylor's Autobiography (1885), vol. i, pp. 74 and 159, 160.

† He became Sir Alexander Burnes and was murdered at Cabul in 1841.

history, backed up by a map, in such a lively manner that I swallowed a small quantity of instruction without much nausea. . . What a woman Mrs Norton is! as beautiful I think as it is possible to be; much more so, even, than I thought her in London—but tiresome society, never natural for one moment, and affecting to be so much more wicked than there is the slightest call for' (Vol. I, pp. 81–82).

Many years afterwards her pen had lost none of its vivacity. 'The Gladstones are jewels of neighbours,' she writes from Broadstairs, and 'I like *her* very much indeed'; but she agreed with Lady Theresa Lewis 'in not thinking Mr G. pleasant. . . I daresay he *is* very clever, and he is good-natured, doing his best to bring down his mind to the level of mine—but fails. He is always above me, and then he does not converse—he harangues—and the more he says the more I don't understand.' If for this she received, as she anticipated, a 'snubbing' from Lord Clarendon, Miss Eden's impressions would certainly have met with more sympathetic appreciation from not a few of the great statesman's friends and acquaintances in later years. Somewhat later, writing from Eden Lodge in 1860, she gives a most humorous description of a visit from the old Duke of Bedford, and of the strange little parsimonies of that very wealthy and in reality generous Whig magnate which amused the London world of the fifties.

The end of Clarendon's mission to Spain was the opening for him of a new career at home. His private and his public life were alike changed. He was a bachelor, he was within sight of forty, and for some time past he had wished to be married; but how was he, condemned to prolonged exile at Madrid, to find himself a wife? To his sister Theresa he had not been afraid to entrust the responsibility of selection; and she had been keeping her eyes open. They had fallen in the first instance on the adopted daughter of 'Conversation Sharp,' who combined the desirable qualifications of good looks, a considerable fortune, and a '*loving eye*.' Her trustful brother was at first a little suspicious on the subject of looks, but such was his confidence in her judgment that 'he would be content to marry any woman without seeing her,' if only she had his sister's unqualified approval. 'In short, I give you

carte blanche to arrange it for me *à la française*, and I consider that the *ne plus ultra* of confidence.' However, this was not to be, for before the year was out the lady in question had become the wife of Thomas Drummond, Under Secretary for Ireland. His sister's second venture was crowned with success. She had discovered in Lady Katherine Barham, the daughter of Lord Verulam, whose husband had lately died, the very person to promote the welfare and secure the happiness of her brother. His mother and his other relatives united in the lady's praise; and, without making any pretence of sentiment, he acquiesced in their choice. The proposal made by his sister was duly accepted, and when he returned to England in 1839 he was an engaged man. The marriage, however prosaic its antecedents, proved a singularly fortunate one. Lord and Lady Clarendon were devoted to each other; and their home life could not have been happier, had the preliminaries to their courtship been of a more romantic character.

Even stronger testimony to the capacity of Clarendon than the appreciative language of his chiefs is to be found in the efforts they made to secure his services in responsible and difficult positions. Even before he got back from Madrid, Lord Melbourne had offered him the government of Canada; but his friend Charles Greville, backed by his own inclinations, persuaded him that his position in the House of Lords and his experience abroad combined to mark out for him a career of parliamentary statesmanship at home. Lord Melbourne continued anxious to attach him directly to his Ministry, which greatly needed strengthening, but Clarendon would not sacrifice his independence for a subordinate post; and it was not till he was offered the Privy Seal with a seat in the Cabinet in October, 1839, that he was induced to join the Melbourne Government.

During the short two years of office that remained for the Melbourne Ministry, Clarendon found himself, with Lord Holland, remonstrating and protesting within the Cabinet against the pronouncedly anti-French policy of the masterful Palmerston, exciting in the minds of the latter and his friends an unfounded and unjust suspicion that Clarendon was intriguing against him and was anxious to become his successor. Palmerston had

his way; and, though for a time the danger of war between France and England was great, his firmness prevailed. Thiers, the most fiery and anti-English of French Statesmen, fell; and Guizot, the new Minister, and his Sovereign were determined, if the latter's subjects would let them, to maintain peace with England. Rightly or wrongly, Palmerston had succeeded. No wonder that Lord Brougham found him at the end of November, 1840, in the best of spirits. A few months more, and Lord Melbourne's Ministry was at end, and Lord Clarendon consequently in Opposition.

In the great controversy of Free Trade versus Protection Clarendon went with his party for Free Trade. His brother Charles had been the earliest member of parliament of any position to take up the Free Trade cause; and he had had, to begin with, the leading statesmen of both sides, Whigs as well as Tories, against him. Charles' general sympathies were with the Radical wing of his party, while Clarendon distinctly tended to the more conservative section of the Whigs. When, in 1846, Peel, after passing his great measure of economic reform, left office, Lord John Russell succeeded him. In the following year he persuaded Clarendon to accept the Irish Viceroyalty with a seat in the Cabinet on its becoming vacant by the death of Lord Bessborough, with whom it had been already arranged to bring the Viceroyal system of Irish Government to an end. Thus Clarendon believed that he would be the last of the Viceroys, for the Bill which Lord John Russell and he brought before Parliament swept away 'Castle Government' and provided an additional Secretary of State for the future management of Irish affairs. The measure at first met with very general approbation; but lengthy delays occurred and opposition sprang up, till at length it appeared that in Ireland, or at least amongst Irish representatives, the Bill had no friends at all; and it was accordingly dropped. Hence Clarendon was disappointed in getting release from his arduous office till the Ministry fell before Palmerston's famous 'tit for tat to John Russell' in 1852. Only a couple of months before, the Prime Minister had wished to assign to him the Foreign Office, vacated by Palmerston—a place for which his abilities and public opinion seemed to destine

him. But hitches arose. He was not, at that time, *bien vu* (whatever the reason) at Windsor; and there was some fear that Palmerston might feel that he had been supplanted, and that the late Minister or his friends would make his path difficult to him. Clarendon neither then nor at any time pressed his claims for preferment, but on this occasion he was evidently disappointed.*

Lord Clarendon during these years had been so completely absorbed in Irish affairs, that he had had but little time to attend the House of Lords or to follow discussions in the Cabinet. His specific views as to foreign policy it is not easy to make out. When, in June 1850, Palmerston in his famous Don Pacifico speech defended the action of the Russell Ministry since it had come into power, he won a magnificent victory along the whole line; and no one read with greater admiration and sympathy than Clarendon the speech which he truly said would 'place Palmerston on a pinnacle at home, whatever it might do abroad.' It is clear at the same time from Lady Clarendon's contemporary journal, that the personal triumph of Palmerston was dreaded as adding to the despotic authority over his colleagues and party of one whom they considered a very dangerous Minister; and in December 1851, when Clarendon was tentatively offered Lord Palmerston's place, he himself writes to his brother-in-law of 'the mischievous and disgraceful diplomacy of the last five years.' A few weeks later, just before the Ministry fell, in a letter to his sister Lady Theresa Lewis, he records his belief that, though Lord John Russell might have his faults and had made mistakes, 'he possessed great talents and great virtues; and having been long the head of a great party he was the only man fit to lead the House of Commons.'

When the Derby Government fell, after a few months of office—the combined result of a General Election and the Disraeli Budget—Aberdeen, finding that Lord John was unwilling to undertake the Foreign Office in addition to the leadership of the House of Commons, concurred in a temporary arrangement under which Clarendon should succeed him as Foreign Secretary in the following February, when the Parliamentary Session

* Clarendon to Sir G. C. Lewis, Dec. 26, 1851.

was to begin. The arrangement was carried out, and at last Clarendon found himself in the position which for many years he and all his friends had been anxious that he should fill.

With the exception of the Crimean War, Great Britain has remained for a hundred years at peace with all the Great Powers of the world. It was the fate of Lord Clarendon to be Foreign Minister from the commencement of that war to its close. On February 4, 1854, the Russian Ambassador, much affected, took final leave of Lord Clarendon at the Foreign Office. 'Poor man!' says Lady Clarendon in her journal, 'he has ardently desired peace, and is wretched.' On March 26, 1856, Lord Clarendon, as representative of his country at the Congress of Paris, signed the treaties which inaugurated the peace. No one, therefore, could be in a better position to give an authentic account of the motives of the Aberdeen Government in going to war, of the conduct of Ministers during its course, and of that of Lord Palmerston's Government in bringing it to a close. The tale, however, has been already told again and again from various standpoints. Clarendon himself, always a close friend of Henry Reeve, then Editor of 'The Edinburgh,' was responsible for an article in that Review fifty-one years ago, which dealt with the early volumes of the picturesque and rhetorical Kinglake. Biographies in great number, including those of Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell, have already made the public acquainted with the whole story; and it was not to be expected that much additional light would be thrown upon these events by the Clarendon correspondence. The Coalition Government was an unfortunate experiment. At a most critical period the members of the Cabinet, all of them high-minded men and sincerely anxious for peace, differed profoundly as to the best means of obtaining it. The firm clear policy favoured by Lord John, Lord Palmerston, and Lord Clarendon was hampered by the hesitations of Lord Aberdeen, whose inability to guide his Cabinet and to render assistance to his Foreign Secretary is painfully apparent. In times of terrible difficulty Lord John said no more than the truth when he wrote to Clarendon in March, 1854, 'that the great want of all is a head of the

English Cabinet.' And he felt deeply his own immense responsibility for prolonging the dangerous state of things that existed. The Duke of Newcastle's management of the War Department he thought inefficient; and he believed that Lord Palmerston was the man who could best face the formidable dangers confronting us. Lord John's resignation of course put an end to the Ministry, and, of course also, rendered his colleagues furious. But the fall of the Government was a gain to the country; and the unrepentant Lord John, who whatever may have been his faults *did* love his country, had the hardihood to declare to the horrified Clarendon that 'what he had just done was one of the wisest and most useful acts of his life.'

In the Aberdeen Cabinet there was an exceptional number of men of the highest ability and political standing. Nevertheless the Clarendon papers only confirm the belief, first, that from divergences of opinion and temperament amongst its members and the absence of controlling guidance it was hopelessly unfitted to steer the country through the tempests of 1853-56, and secondly, that the country was right in seeing in Palmerston the man of the hour. They further show that from before its commencement to the very close of the War, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—the Great Eltchi of Kinglake—was greatly distrusted by the Foreign Secretary and his colleagues, and would on more than one occasion have been recalled, had it not been felt that such a measure at a time of crisis would have done more harm than good. 'Constantinople is at all times a peculiar place,' said Bismarck to Lord Ampthill a quarter of a century later, 'in which the Powers never seem to have their representatives in hand as at other places.' His own remedy for this was 'not to let his Ambassador know too much at a time!'

Lord Clarendon remained at the Foreign Office till Lord Palmerston fell in 1858, sharing of course the responsibility of the Government for the China War, and for the measures taken to repress the Indian Mutiny. His spirits did not rise like his Chief's to meet the dangers as they thickened round him. When he

* Life of Lord Goschen, vol. i, p. 229.

received the news of Inkerman, it had caused him to anticipate further disaster and defeat before Sebastopol; and in August 1857, as the Indian telegrams came pouring in, he wrote to his wife that he was far less sanguine than his colleagues; for 'his own opinion had been settled for some time past, that we should lose India after a protracted and exhausting struggle to reconquer it.' Yet a month later he writes to Sir G. C. Lewis blaming Palmerston for his determination that the country 'should win off its own bat' without having recourse to the assistance of foreign troops. 'Palmerston opposes everything that is out of the beaten track, and I own that his want of energy, and his system of hoping and believing, instead of acting, have disappointed me woe-fully!' And this was by no means the only undeserved criticism which Clarendon, in his intimate letters, passes on the character and doings of his colleagues.

In Lord Palmerston's last Cabinet, formed in 1859, Lord John Russell went to the Foreign Office; and Clarendon, who was unwilling to surrender his independence for any place except the one for which he felt himself specially qualified, declined to join the Ministry. Yet, whenever he felt he could be of use, through the friendly relations he had established with foreign courts and statesmen, his services were offered to, and freely utilised by, the Foreign Office; and, even when his political opponents were in power, he never withheld from them information likely to be of assistance. When writing to decline (most rightly) Lord Derby's invitation to remain at the Foreign Office under him in 1866, he declared that 'allegiance to Party was the only strong political feeling he had'; and, as regards internal politics, there is no evidence in these volumes that he was deeply interested one way or the other; indeed he seems almost to wonder that Lord John or anyone else should really care about Reform. In that branch of politics for which he really did care he served his country truly without the least bias of narrow partisanship. His natural tendency was towards moderate conservatism at home and abroad; and he had little or no sympathy with that intense feeling for the rising national spirit of Italy which heartily united Palmerston, Russell, and Gladstone, the three strong men of the Cabinet of 1859.

We cannot therefore regret that he did not go to the Foreign Office in that year. He was twice again to be at the head of that department; viz. in Lord Russell's last Government, which fell in 1866, after a few months' tenure of power, in a vain struggle for moderate reform; and in Gladstone's first Government (1868), in which he was Foreign Secretary till his death a few days before the Franco-German War began.

The shock that he received in the Russell Government at the introduction into the Cabinet of Mr Goschen—a *novus homo*—is an instance of the conservative sentiments of a section of the aristocratic Whigs, with which the Prime Minister had no sympathy; and Clarendon's vehement condemnation of Lord Russell's action is amusing when one recalls the lecture the former had given to his colleagues in 1846 on their unfortunate tendency to aristocratic exclusiveness in forming Liberal Administrations. The party whip, who possibly knew little of Goschen's abilities and character, and had probably never heard of the 'Theory of Foreign Exchanges,' was scandalised. Amongst others Lord de Grey and Mr Gladstone strongly objected to the newcomer; but Lord Russell bore down all opposition and insisted on adding to the national councils the ablest and worthiest recruit enlisted during a long series of years.

In reading Lord Clarendon's letters it has to be constantly borne in mind that for the most part they were written in extreme intimacy, and reflect the sentiment of the moment. It would never do to take his sometimes scathing references to colleagues and contemporaries as the considered judgment of an experienced statesman on their merits—or their want of them. It is quite unnecessary to believe that Hammond of the Foreign Office was 'a self-sufficient donkey and coxcomb,' or Sir Charles Murray 'an Ass'; that Sir Charles Trevelyan was 'a ravening wolf,' or Sir Stafford Northcote 'a prig'; that Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was always playing his own game rather than his country's; that Lord Derby was more entirely lacking in political principle than even Disraeli; and that the conduct of Lord John Russell, an intimate personal friend both long before and long after 1855, was that 'neither of a Statesman nor a Gentleman.'

It is the merit of these letters that they *are* unconstrained; that they do not attempt to conceal the emotions of the hour. Sir Herbert Maxwell's long experience of public life has qualified him in a high degree to describe the career of a statesman like Lord Clarendon. It is clear that he has had to make his selection amongst vast masses of correspondence dealing with matters both of public and private interest, and he is to be congratulated on the ability with which he has performed his task. He has drawn the portrait of one of the most eminent statesmen of the Victorian era, of one who was regarded by common consent, in the words of his friend Reeve, 'as the most finished gentleman, the most charming and genial companion, and the most accomplished Foreign Minister of our times.' He has not indeed entirely avoided mistakes. Palmerston, of course, did not lead the Opposition in the lifetime of Peel; and frequenters of Brooks' will be surprised to read that 'Poodle' Byng died in 1847. But these are trifles. A more serious criticism is that on several occasions Sir Herbert has shown too little respect for the private and confidential nature of Clarendon's letters. Letters written in absolute confidence by a man to his wife and to his most intimate friends, in the belief that they will remain private, should surely not be flung before the public without the direct authority and approval of those that represent him. That the family of the late Lord Clarendon have authorised the publication of the whole of these papers we do not believe; and, till that authority had been obtained, their private and confidential character should have been respected. Of Lord Clarendon's home life we would willingly have heard more; and of that brilliant circle of friends and guests he and Lady Clarendon used to assemble round them at the Grove and in London. 'An irreparable colleague, a statesman of many gifts, a most lovable and genial man,' was Gladstone's entry in his diary after Clarendon's death. Ambassadors and officials who served under him regarded him with feelings hardly less warm than those of his Chief and his Cabinet colleagues.

Lord Lyons the ambassador was in character and disposition a singular contrast to Lord Clarendon the

statesman. Assuredly the qualities that go to make a successful Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs are not necessarily the same as those that enable an ambassador or diplomatic agent to play in his own line a useful and distinguished part. This is well pointed out by Lord Newton, a most competent judge, in his comments on Lord Salisbury's offer in 1886 of the Foreign Secretaryship to Lord Lyons—an offer which the latter wisely declined. As the representative of his country first at Washington and afterwards at Paris he proved himself an admirable instrument for furthering under very great difficulties the policy that had been determined on. His was no doubt a less brilliant and less powerful personality than that of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe; but how much would Lord Clarendon and his chiefs in the middle years of the century have preferred him to Lord Stratford as their agent at Constantinople! Lord Lyons was always absolutely to be trusted to carry out his instructions to the letter, not going beyond them or falling short of them by a single inch. It was not his business to make a policy; yet he often helped in reality to guide it, by the wise advice he gave his chiefs on the frequent occasions when they sought it from him. Lyons was a diplomatist of the old school, anxious himself rather to avoid than to seek public fame, and to keep the newspapers at a distance. He used to say that, during the five trying years of his residence in the United States, 'he had never taken a drink nor made a speech.' His letters from Washington are full of interest; and there can be no doubt that his cautious and judicious bearing during the critical period of the War of Secession contributed very largely to the maintenance of Anglo-American peace.

When in the autumn of 1867 Lord Lyons entered upon his duties in Paris, and the Embassy began which was to last for twenty years, and to see mighty changes and catastrophes sweep over France, the Second Empire had already begun to lose something of its glitter. Between France and Prussia a feeling of jealousy and hostility prevailed, yet Lord Lyons fully believed in the sincere desire of the Emperor for peace; and Lord Clarendon, returning about the same time through Paris from Berlin, felt equally assured that France need have no fear of Prussia, unless indeed unjust provocation

were given her. This was in 1868. But national feeling was strained, and the happening of some unlucky incident might rouse a temper on either side that no Government could resist. British policy, whether expressed by Lord Stanley or Lord Clarendon, was to prevent friction arising, and to use every effort to bring about better relations between the rival Powers. England wished to preserve the peace of Europe; but in the rivalry of ambitions between France and Prussia, should war ensue, she did not feel it to be her duty to interfere. As regards Belgium, indeed, our word was pledged and our interest was great; and Mr Gladstone had intimated that her independence was to be treated by France 'with not less respect than the independence of England herself.'

The letters of Lord Lyons from Paris give a most valuable and interesting account almost from day to day of affairs in France during the last two years of the French Empire and the first fifteen of the French Republic. Much has been written already on this period, and the story has been told by some who were amongst the chief actors on the political stage; but here we have the impressions and opinions at the time of a very clear-sighted observer, entirely free from bias, whose only desire it was to put before his Government an accurate report of passing events. No future historian of the period can afford to neglect these letters.

We have no space to consider here the extraordinarily interesting changes and vicissitudes witnessed by Lord Lyons in the domestic politics of France. A Napoleonic Empire under absolute rule, but at the time appearing to make long steps towards the establishment of a parliamentary system, crumbled into dust before foreign invasion; and years were to elapse before republican government was able to establish itself firmly and give hope of permanent internal peace. And not France only but Europe and the world felt the effects of the German triumph; so that after 1870, for many a long year, scarcely a step could be taken by any Power beyond its own frontier without first ascertaining the views entertained at Berlin.

British Foreign Secretaries and diplomatists had done their best to avert war, and had failed. Bismarck, in complimentary mood, once declared to Lady Amphill

that, had Lord Clarendon's life been prolonged, peace between Prussia and France would have been preserved. But in truth few wars have deserved so well the often misapplied adjective 'inevitable.' Bismarck was aiming at the consolidation of the various German States into a powerful German nation. That there would be a strong tendency in this direction amongst the Germans themselves had been foretold long before by clear-sighted men. It was quite certain, on the other hand, that no French Napoleonic Empire would suffer such an accession to Prussian strength unless at the same time France obtained a wide extension of territory. Indeed it may well be doubted if the French nation itself, however governed, would not have held the same view. After the arrival of Lyons at Paris each nation was keenly watching the preparations of its rival for war and comparing them with its own; and each was anxious that, if war came, it should be clearly the result of the unprovoked and unjustifiable conduct of the other. Lyons placed little confidence in the language of the French Government, and was distressed at the Belgian complication which might affect its good relations with England.

'The leading object of Bismarck,' wrote Clarendon in April 1869, 'is to detach us from France. We might to-morrow, if we pleased, enter into a coalition with Prussia against France for the protection of Belgian independence, which is a European and not an exclusively French question; but we will do nothing of the kind so long as there is a hope that France will act with common honesty' (Vol. I, p. 218).

The position of neutral, Lord Lyons well knew from previous experience, is not one which earns anything but ill-will from either of the belligerents. Yet it was the only one which British statesmen could possibly have taken up. When at last the war was over, France lay prostrate at the feet of what had become the German Empire; and European ministers and diplomatists had to accommodate themselves to a world in which the centre of gravity was changed. The leading considerations that a British Government had to bear in mind appear very clearly in the letters of Lord Lyons from Paris, and of that brilliant diplomatist, Lord Odo Russell,

from Berlin, where he had established most friendly and intimate relations with Bismarck.

'The two great objects of Bismarck's policy,' wrote Lord Odo in March 1873, 'are (1) the supremacy of Germany in Europe and of the German race in the world. (2) The neutralization of the power and influence of the Latin race in France and elsewhere. To obtain these objects he will go any lengths while he lives, so that we must be prepared for surprises in the future. . . . The re-establishment of the future balance of power in Europe on a general peace footing is *the* thing Diplomacy should work for. . . . The Germans, as you know, look upon the war of revenge as unavoidable and are making immense preparations for it' (Vol. II, p. 41).

Lord Lyons agreed with his correspondent that 'the *one* object of diplomacy should be the establishment of the balance of power on a peace footing.' Strange as it seems, only eight or nine years later the relations between France and Germany underwent a change; and it was with much satisfaction that Bismarck saw French military enterprise becoming fully occupied in Tunis and elsewhere outside Europe, perceiving, as he did, that in these regions it would probably be with England rather than with Germany that critical questions would henceforth arise.

'During the years which immediately followed the war'—Lord Lyons explains to Lord Granville in December '81—'the feeling of France towards Germany was composed of furious hatred and of mortal dread. . . . [Germany] interfered dictatorially with France even in internal matters. Her object seemed to be not only to impede the restoration of French strength and wealth, but to prevent the French recovering even prestige anywhere' (Vol. II, p. 264).

Germany was then preparing to resist a war of revenge; Frenchmen believed that Germany, jealous of their growing strength, was aiming at their immediate and complete destruction. By the year 1881 things had changed. Neither nation anticipated immediate attack from the other; and ambitious statesmen in France, such as Gambetta, aimed (undoubtedly with the approval and encouragement of Bismarck) at recovering national prestige by military enterprise outside Europe. The hope ultimately to regain their lost provinces was

never abandoned by Frenchmen; but its realisation was postponed till renewed strength and prestige, and the favourable alliances which would follow, improved the prospect of success. For the present the thought of *revanche* was abandoned.

Why is it, asks one Foreign Secretary after another—Lord Granville, Lord Derby, Lord Rosebery, Lord Salisbury—that the French Government persists in maintaining an unaccommodating and irritating attitude whenever British interests are concerned? Many would say that Lord Salisbury and Lord Granville (for both were in some sort responsible) had gone too far in acquiescing in the unjustifiable action of France in Tunis. In 1875 the purchase of the Suez Canal shares had caused a good deal of soreness in France; and the Anglo-Turkish Convention of three years later created the greatest irritation. This, says Lord Newton with truth, was the first of a series of difficulties which unfortunately impaired French and English relations for many years; and he proceeds to show how unreasonably French susceptibilities had been excited.*

Tonquin, New Hebrides, Madagascar, the Newfoundland Fisheries, and above all Egypt, presented ample materials for keen discussions between the Foreign Offices of the two nations.

‘I am very unhappy,’ wrote Lyons (June 1884), ‘at the growing ill-will between France and England which exists on both sides of the channel. It is not that I suppose that France has any deliberate intention of going to war with us. But the two nations come into contact in every part of the world. In every part of it questions arise which, in the present state of feeling, excite mutual suspicion and irritation. Who can say when and where, in this state of things, some local events may not produce a serious quarrel, or some high-handed proceedings of hot-headed officials occasion an actual collision?’ (Vol. II, p. 332.)

Bismarck had reasoned well. It was his game to prevent France from building up alliances with other Great Powers. He saw, moreover, with much complacency the severely strained relations between Great

* Lord Lyons, vol. II, p. 159.

Britain and Russia. On the whole things seemed to promise well for the maintenance of the German primacy on the Continent, and the prolongation of a state of jar and jealousy between the two great nations of Western Europe. 'The French are inexplicable.' (Salisbury to Lyons, Feb. 1887.) 'One would have thought that under existing circumstances it was unnecessary to make enemies—that there were enough provided for France by nature just now.' Then came the renewal of the Triple Alliance, causing some natural alarm to France. Could she rely upon Russia? Even so, could a Franco-Russian Alliance prevail against that of all the other Powers?

In this unsettled condition of Europe, Lord Lyons, now feeling the weight of years, resigned the post to which he had given such arduous service. His death took place in 1887. For a quarter of a century he had strenuously laboured to promote good relations between his own Government and those of the United States and of France. Many years were still to pass before friendly feelings took the place of jealousy and suspicion. But the change, in which we rejoice to-day, came at last; and without any exaggerated patriotic self-satisfaction we may fairly assert, when we recall the strained relations of the not distant past, that it is mainly to the patience and self-restraint of British statesmen, supported by the ability, tact and energy of British diplomatists, that those happy results are due. The national conscience may well feel free of the crime of having offered in any direction unjust provocation.

The preservation of 'the Balance of Power on a peace footing,' as Lord Lyons well put it, is still the main object of British diplomacy. Europe needs, and British interests also need, both a strong Germany and a strong France. A German dictatorship on the Continent, such as Bismarck was aiming at and went far to attain, or a French dictatorship, such as Napoleon III would have achieved had his troops been victorious in 1870, could never be regarded with equanimity by England. No British Government would encourage, and still less take part in, a war whose object it was to reverse the results of the great struggle of a generation and a half ago. That struggle England did her best to prevent, and her

policy now, as then, is a policy of peace. The security of herself and of her widespread Empire is dependent upon her own strength; and that strength is and will be exerted to preserve the peace of the world.

Whilst our statesmen have been working for this great end, different methods, applicable to different circumstances, have been resorted to. At one time we hear much of 'The Concert of Europe,' at another time of 'Our splendid isolation,' at another of 'Our alliances,' and so on. It is quite clear, though parliamentary oppositions have frequently assured us of the contrary, that the voice of this country counts for a very great deal in the counsels of Europe. At the present time our influence is in part due to the recognition by foreign governments of the disinterested character of our foreign policy. We are not aiming at getting anything for ourselves at the expense of other people. Sir Edward Grey has won not only the confidence of his own countrymen, but that of foreign statesmen as well. This is no small achievement. Europe, however, has not yet advanced to that point where moral considerations are all in all. Peace amongst the Great Powers would have been broken long ago, had not respect been felt for our armed power as well as for our good intentions. An overwhelmingly powerful navy is a necessity for the security of our Empire; and, when war hangs in the balance, it is a heavy weight in the scale of European peace. This is an old story. It was at the end of the 17th century that the Marquess of Halifax used these words to his countrymen:

'It may be said now to England, Martha! Martha! thou art busy about many things, but one thing is necessary. To the question, what shall we do to be saved in this world? there is no answer but this, *Look to your Moate*. The first article of an Englishman's creed must be that he believeth in the sea, without which there needeth no General Council to pronounce him incapable of salvation here.'

There are enthusiasts amongst us to-day who would urge us, to 'set a good example' in the direction of general disarmament by reducing the navy. Lord Clarendon's attempt to induce Bismarck in January 1870 to agree with France in partial disarmament was a

singularly unsuccessful bit of diplomacy.* He and Mr Gladstone, without the knowledge of their Cabinet colleagues but with the permission of Queen Victoria, and apparently at the instigation of Napoleon himself, sent to Berlin a moving despatch suggesting a reduction of the Prussian army if the French would agree to a reduction *pari passu* of theirs. France, observed Lord Clarendon, was now under responsible government, and was never more peacefully disposed, Emperor and people being at one in their desire for national economy and peace.† What guarantee, asked Bismarck in reply, can you give us for the maintenance of peace or for security against danger? 'You live in a happy island and have not to fear invasion, but on our frontiers are three great Empires, against whom we must take precautions, and as to these matters we are bound to judge for ourselves and on our own responsibility.' Thus the well-meant efforts of the two British statesmen came to nothing. Reduction of armaments will naturally follow the growth of general confidence in the peaceful dispositions of nations towards each other. In times of mutual distrust and suspicion, and of unsatisfied national ambitions, it is pure waste of time, or worse, to urge disarmament.

There is much good reading in the two works that Sir Herbert Maxwell and Lord Newton have put before the public; and the result on the whole, unless we are much mistaken, will be to increase the respect felt for the aims and objects of British foreign policy, and for the ability and skill with which our statesmen and diplomatic agents endeavour to carry it out.

* It is somewhat strange that this curious episode, which forms one of the most interesting chapters in Lord Lyons' Life and is there given in detail for the first time, should be barely mentioned in that of Lord Clarendon. It is briefly recorded by Ollivier, 'Empire Libéral,' vol. xiii, pp. 64-70.

† 'Life of Lord Lyons,' vol. i, p. 252.

Art. 2.—GEORGE SAND. ✓

George Sand, sa Vie et ses Œuvres. Vol. III (1838-1848).

Par Vladimir Karénine. Paris : Plon, 1912.

IT has much occurred to us, touching those further liberations of the subordinate sex which fill our ears just now with their multitudinous sound, that the promoters of the great cause make a good deal less than they might of one of their very first contentious 'assets,' if it may not indeed be looked at as quite the first; and thereby fail to pass about, to the general elation, a great vessel of truth. Is this because the life and example of George Sand are things unknown or obscure to the talkers and fighters of to-day—present and vivid as they were to those of the last mid-century, or because of some fear that to invoke victory in her name might, for particular, for even rueful reasons, not be altogether a safe course? It is difficult to account otherwise for the fact that so ample and embossed a shield, and one that shines too at last with a strong and settled lustre, is rather left hanging on the wall than seen to cover advances or ward off attacks in the fray. Certain it is that if a lapse of tradition appeared at one time to have left a little in the lurch the figure of the greatest of all women of letters, of Letters in truth most exactly, as we hold her surely to have been, that explanation should have begun to fail, some fourteen years ago, with the publication of the first volume of Madame Vladimir Karénine's biography, and even in spite of the fact that this singularly interesting work was not till a twelvemonth ago to arrive at the dignity of a third, which leaves it, for all its amplitude, still incomplete. The latest instalment, now before us, follows its predecessors after an interval that had alarmed us not a little for the proper consummation; and the story is even now carried but to the eve of the Revolution of 1848, after which its heroine (that of the Revolution, we may almost say, as well as of the narrative) was to have some twenty-seven years to live. Madame Karénine appears to be a Russian critic writing under a pseudonym; portions of her overbrimming study have appeared dispersedly, we gather, in Russian periodicals, but the harmonious French idiom, of which she is all-sufficient

mistress, welds them effectively together, and the result may already be pronounced a commemorative monument of all but the first order. The first order in such attempts has for its sign a faculty of selection and synthesis, not to say a sense of composition and proportion, which neither the chronicler nor the critic in these too multiplied pages is able consistently to exhibit; though on the other hand they represent quite the high-water mark of patience and persistence, of the ideal biographic curiosity. They enjoy further the advantage of the documented state in a degree that was scarce to have been hoped for, every source of information that had remained in reserve—and these proved admirably numerous—having been opened to our inquirer by the confidence of the illustrious lady's two great-granddaughters, both alive at the time the work was begun. Add to this that there has grown up in France a copious George Sand literature, a vast body of illustrative odds and ends, relics and revelations, on which the would-be propagator of the last word is now free to draw—always with discrimination. Ideally, well-nigh overwhelmingly informed we may at present therefore hold ourselves; and were that state all that is in question for us nothing could exceed our advantage.

Just the beauty and the interest of the case are, however, that such a condition by no means exhausts our opportunity, since in no like connexion could it be less said that to know most is most easily or most complacently to conclude. May we not decidedly feel the sense and the 'lesson,' the suggestive spread, of a career as a thing scarce really to be measured when the effect of more and more acquaintance with it is simply to make the bounds of appreciation recede? This is why the figure now shown us, blazed upon to the last intensity by the lamplight of investigation, and with the rank oil consumed in the process fairly filling the air, declines to let us off from an hour of that contemplation which yet involves discomfiture for us so long as certain lucidities on our own part, certain serenities of assurance, fail correspondingly to play up. We feel ourselves so out-faced, as it were; we somehow want in any such case to meet and match the assurances with which the subject himself or herself immitigably bristles, and are nevertheless

by no means certain that our bringing up premature forces or trying to reply with lights of our own may not check the current of communication, practically without sense for us unless flowing at its fullest. At our biographer's rate of progress we shall still have much to wait for; but it can meanwhile not be said that we have not plenty to go on with. To this may be added that the stretch of 'life,' apart from the more concrete exhibition, already accounted for by our three volumes (if one may discriminate between 'production' and life to a degree that is in this connexion exceptionally questionable), represents to all appearance the most violently and variously agitated face of the career. The establishment of the Second Empire ushered in for Madame Sand, we seem in course of preparation to make out, the long period already more or less known to fame, that is to criticism, as the period of her great placidity, her more or less notorious appeasement; a string of afternoon hours as hazily golden as so many reigns of Antonines, when her genius had mastered the high art of acting without waste, when a happy play of inspiration had all the air, so far as our spectatorship went, of filling her large capacity and her beautiful form to the brim, and when the gathered fruit of what she had dauntlessly done and been heaped itself upon her table as a rich feast for memory and philosophy. So she came in for the enjoyment of all the *sagesse* her contemporaries (with only such exceptions as M. Paul de Musset and Madame Louise Colet and the few discordant pleaders for poor Chopin) finally rejoiced on their side to acclaim; the sum of her aspects 'composing,' arranging themselves in relation to each other, with a felicity that nothing could exceed and that swept with great glosses and justifications every aspect of the past. To few has it been given to 'pay' so little, according to *our* superstition of payment, in proportion to such enormities of ostensibly buying or borrowing—which fact, we have to recognise, left an existence as far removed either from moral, or intellectual, or even social bankruptcy as if it had proceeded from the first but on the most saving lines.

That is what remains on the whole most inimitable in the picture—the impression it conveys of an art of life by which the rough sense of the homely adage that

we may not both eat our cake and have it was to be signally falsified; this wondrous mistress of the matter strikes us so as having consumed *her* refreshment, her vital supply, to the last crumb, so far as the provision meant at least freedom and ease, and yet having ever found on the shelf the luxury in question undiminished. Superlatively interesting the idea of how this result was, how it *could* be, achieved—given the world as we on our side of the water mainly know it; and it is as meeting the mystery that the monument before us has doubtless most significance. We shall presently see, in the light of our renewed occasion, how the question is solved; yet we may as well at once say that this will have had for its conclusion to present our heroine—mainly figuring as a novelist of the romantic or sentimental order once pre-eminent but now of shrunken credit—simply as a supreme case of the successful practice of life itself. We have to distinguish for this induction after a fashion in which neither Madame Sand nor her historian has seemed at all positively concerned to distinguish; the indifference on the historian's part sufficiently indicated, we feel, by the complacency with which, to be thorough, she explores even the most thankless tracts of her author's fictional activity, telling the tales over, as she comes to them, on much the same scale on which she unfolds the situations otherwise documented. The writer of 'Consuelo' and 'Claudie' and a hundred other things is to this view a literary genius whose output, as our current term so gracefully has it, the exercise of an inordinate personal energy happens to mark; whereas the exercise of personal energy is for ourselves what most reflects the genius—recorded though this again chances here to be through the inestimable fact of the possession of style. Of the action of that perfect, that only real preservative in face of other perils George Sand is a wondrous example; but her letters alone suffice to show it, and the style of her letters is no more than the breath of her nature, her so remarkable one, in which expression and aspiration were much the same function. That is what it is really to *have* style—when you set about performing the act of life. The forms taken by this latter impulse then cover everything; they serve for your adventures not less than they may serve at

their most refined pitch for your Lélías and your Mauprats.

This means accordingly, we submit, that those of us who at the present hour 'feel the change,' as the phrase is, in the computation of the feminine range, with the fullest sense of what it may portend, shirk at once our opportunity and our obligation in not squeezing for its last drop of testimony such an exceptional body of illustration as we here possess. It has so much to say to any view—whether, in the light of old conventions, the brightest or the darkest—of what may either glitter or gloom in a conquest of every license by our contemporaries of the contending sex, that we scarce strain a point in judging it a provision of the watchful fates for this particular purpose and profit: its answers are so full to most of our uncertainties. It is to be noted of course that the creator of Lélia and of Mauprat was on the one hand a woman of an extraordinary gift and on the other a woman resignedly and triumphantly voteless—doing without that boon so beautifully, for free development and the acquisition and application of 'rights,' that we seem to see her sardonically smile, before our present tumults, as at a rumpus about nothing; as if women need set such preposterous machinery in motion for obtaining things which she had found it of the first facility, right and left, to stretch forth her hand and take. There it is that her precedent stands out—apparently to a blind generation; so that some little insistence on the method of her appropriations would seem to be peculiarly in place. It was a method that may be summed up indeed in a fairly simple, if comprehensive, statement: it consisted in her dealing with life exactly as if she had been a man—exactly not being too much to say. Nature certainly had contributed on her behalf to this success; it had given her a constitution and a temperament, the kind of health, the kind of mind, the kind of courage, that might most directly help—so that she had but to convert these strong matters into the kind of experience. The writer of these lines remembers how a distinguished and intimate friend of her later years, who was a very great admirer, said of her to him just after her death that her not having been born a man seemed, when one knew her, but an awkward accident: she had been

to all intents and purposes so fine and frank a specimen of the sex. This anomalous native turn, it may be urged, can have no general application—women cannot be men by the mere trying or by calling themselves 'as good'; they must have been provided with what we have just noted as the outfit. The force of George Sand's exhibition consorts, we contend, none the less perfectly with the logic of the consummation awaiting us, if a multitude of signs are to be trusted, in a more or less near future: that effective repudiation of the *distinctive*, as to function and opportunity, as to working and playing activity, for which the definite removal of immemorial disabilities is but another name. We are in presence already of a practical shrinkage of the distinctive, at the rapidest rate, and that it must shrink till nothing of it worth mentioning is left, what is this but a war-cry (presenting itself also indeed as a plea for peace) with which our ears are familiar? Unless the suppression of the distinctive, however, is to work to the prejudice, as we may fairly call it, of men, drawing them over to the feminine type rather than drawing women over to theirs—which is not what seems most probable—the course of the business will be a virtual undertaking on the part of the half of humanity acting ostensibly for the first time in freedom to annex the male identity, that of the other half, so far as may be at all contrivable, to its own cluster of elements. Individuals are in great world and race movements negligible, and if that undertaking must inevitably appeal to different recruits with a differing cogency, its really enlisting its army or becoming reflected, to a perfectly conceivable vividness, in the mass, is all our demonstration requires. At that point begins the revolution, the shift of the emphasis from the idea of woman's weakness to the idea of her strength—which is where the emphasis has lain, from far back, by his every tradition, on behalf of man; and George Sand's great value, as we say, is that she gives us the vision, gives us the particular case, of the shift achieved, displayed with every assurance and working with every success.

The answer of her life to the question of what an effective annexation of the male identity may amount to, amount to in favouring conditions certainly, but

in conditions susceptible to the highest degree of encouragement and cultivation, leaves nothing to be desired for completeness. This is the moral of her tale, the beauty of what she does for us—that at no point whatever of her history or her character do their power thus to give satisfaction break down; so that what we in fact on the whole most recognise is not the extension she gives to the feminine nature, but the richness that she adds to the masculine. It is not simply that she could don a disguise that gaped at the seams, that she could figure as a man of the mere carnival or pantomime variety, but that she made so virile, so efficient and homogeneous a one. Admirable child of the old order as we find her, she was far from our late-coming theories and fevers—by the reason simply of her not being reduced to them; as to which nothing about her is more eloquent than her living at such ease with a conception of the main relevance of women that is viewed among ourselves as antiquated to 'quaintness.' She could afford the traditional and sentimental, the old romantic and historic theory of the function most natural to them, since she entertained it exactly as a man would. It is not that she fails again and again to represent her heroines as doing the most unconventional things—upon these they freely embark; but they never in the least do them for themselves, themselves as the 'sex,' they do them altogether for men. Nothing could well be more interesting thus than the extraordinary union of the pair of opposites in her philosophy of the relation of the sexes—than the manner in which her immense imagination, the imagination of a man for range and abundance, intervened in the whole matter for the benefit, absolutely, of the so-called stronger party, or to liberate her sisters up to the point at which men may most gain and least lose by the liberation. She read the relation essentially in the plural term—the relations, and her last word about these was as far as possible from being that they are of minor importance to women. Nothing in her view could exceed their importance to women—it left every other far behind it; and nothing that could make for authority in her, no pitch of tone, no range of personal enquiry nor wealth of experience, no acquaintance with

the question that might derive light from free and repeated adventure, but belonged to the business of driving this argument home.

Madame Karénine's third volume is copiously devoted to the period of her heroine's intimacy with Chopin and to the events surrounding this agitated friendship, which largely fill the ten years precedent to '48. Our author is on all this ground overwhelmingly documented, and enlisted though she is in the service of the more successful party to the association—in the sense of Madame Sand's having heartily outlived and survived, not to say professionally and brilliantly 'used,' it—the great composer's side of the story receives her conscientious attention. Curious and interesting in many ways, these reflections of George Sand's middle life afford above all the most pointed illustration of the turn of her personal genius, her aptitude for dealing with men, in the intimate relation, exactly after the fashion in which numberless celebrated men have contributed to their reputation, not to say crowned their claim to superiority, by dealing with women. This being above all the note of her career, with its vivid show of what such dealing could mean for play of mind, for quickening of gift, for general experience and, as we say, intellectual development, for determination of philosophic bent and education of character and fertilisation of fancy, we seem to catch the whole process in the fact, under the light here supplied us, as we catch it nowhere else. It gives us in this application endlessly much to consider—it is in itself so replete and rounded a show; we at once recognise moreover how comparatively little it matters that such works as 'Lucrezia Floriani' and 'Un Hiver à Majorque' should have proceeded from it, cast into the shade as these are, on our biographer's evidence, by a picture of concomitant energies still more attaching. It is not here by the force of her gift for rich improvisation, beautiful as this was, that the extraordinary woman holds us, but by the force of her ability to act herself out, given the astounding quantities concerned in this self. That energy too, we feel, was in a manner an improvisation—so closely allied somehow are both the currents, the flow of literary composition

admirably instinctive and free, and the handling power, as we are constantly moved to call it, the flow of a splendid intelligence all the while at its fullest expression, for the *actual* situations created by her, for whatever it might be that vitally confronted her. Of how to bring about, or at the least find one's self 'in' for, an inordinate number of situations, most of them of the last difficulty, and then deal with them on the spot, in the narrowest quarters as it were, with an eloquence and a plausibility that does them and one's own nature at once a sort of ideal justice, the demonstration here is the fullest—as of what it was further to have her unfailing verbal as well as her unfailing moral inspiration. What predicament could have been more of an hourly strain for instance, as we cannot but suppose, than her finding herself inevitably accompanied by her two children during the stay at Majorca made by Chopin in '38 under her protection? The victory of assurance and of the handling power strikes us as none the less never an instant in doubt, that being essentially but over the general *kind* of inconvenience or embarrassment involved for a mother and a friend in any real consistency of attempt to carry things off male fashion. We do not, it is true, see a man as a mother, any more than we easily see a woman as a gentleman—and least of all perhaps in either case as an awkwardly placed one; but we see Madame Sand as a sufficiently bustling, though rather a rough and ready, father, a father accepting his charge and doing the best possible under the circumstances; the truth being of course that the circumstances never *can* be, even at the worst, or still at the best, the best for parental fondness, so awkward for him as for a mother.

What call, again, upon every sort of presence of mind could have been livelier than the one made by the conditions attending and following the marriage of young Solange Dudevant to the sculptor Clésinger in 1846, when our heroine, summoned by the stress of events both to take responsible action and to rise to synthetic expression, in a situation, that is in presence of a series of demonstrations on her daughter's part, that we seem to find imaginable for a perfect dramatic adequacy only in that particular home circle, fairly

surpassed herself by her capacity to 'meet' everything, meet it much incommoded, yet undismayed, unabashed and unconfuted, and have on it all, to her great advantage, the always prodigious last word? The elements of this especial crisis claim the more attention through its having been, as a test of her powers, decidedly the most acute that she was in her whole course of life to have traversed, more acute even, because more complicated, than the great occasion of her rupture with Alfred de Musset, at Venice in '35, on which such a wealth of contemplation and of ink has been expended. Dramatic enough in their relation to each other certainly those immortal circumstances, immortal so far as immortalised on either side by genius and passion: Musset's return, ravaged and alone, to Paris; his companion's transfer of her favour to Pietro Pagello, whom she had called in to attend her friend medically in illness and whose intervention, so far from simplifying the juncture, complicated it in a fashion probably scarce paralleled in the history of the erotic relation; her retention of Pagello under her protection for the rest of her period in Venice; her marvellously domesticated state, in view of the literary baggage, the collection of social standards, even taking these but at what they were, and the general amplitude of personality, that she brought into residence with her; the conveyance of Pagello to Paris, on her own return, and the apparent signification to him at the very gate that her countenance was then and there withdrawn. This was a brilliant case for her—of coming off with flying colours; but it strikes us as a mere preliminary flourish of the bow or rough practice of scales compared to the high virtuosity which Madame Karénine's new material in respect to the later imbroglio now enables us ever so gratefully to estimate. The protagonist's young children were in the Venetian crisis quite off the scene, and on occasions subsequent to the one we now glance at were old enough and, as we seem free to call it, initiated enough not to solicit our particular concern for them; whereas at the climax of the connexion with Chopin they were of the perfect age (which was the fresh marriageable in the case of Solange) to engage our best anxiety, let alone their being of a salience of sensibility and temper to leave no one of their aspects negligible.

That their parent should not have found herself conclusively 'upset,' sickened beyond repair, or otherwise morally bankrupt, on her having to recognise in her daughter's hideous perversity and depravity, as we learn these things to have been, certain inevitabilities of consequence from the social air of the maternal circle, is really a monumental fact in respect to our great woman's elasticity, her instinct for never abdicating by mere discouragement. Here in especial we get the broad male note—it being so exactly the manly part, and so very questionably the womanly, not to have to draw from such imputations of responsibility too crushing a self-consciousness. Of the extent and variety of danger to which the enjoyment of a moral tone could be exposed and yet superbly survive Madame Karénine's pages give us the measure; they offer us in action the very ideal of an exemplary triumph of character and mind over one of the very highest tides of private embarrassment that it is well possible to conceive. And it is no case of that *passive* acceptance of deplorable matters which has abounded in the history of women, even distinguished ones, whether to the pathetic or to the merely scandalous effect; the acceptance is active, constructive, almost exhilarated by the resources of affirmation and argument that it has at its command. The whole instance is sublime in its sort, thanks to the acuteness of *all* its illustrative sides, the intense interest of which loses nothing in the hands of our chronicler; who perhaps, however, reaches off into the vast vague of Chopin's native affiliations and references with an energy with which we find it a little difficult to keep step.

In speaking as we have done of George Sand's 'use' of each twist of her road as it came—a use which we now recognise as the very thriftiest—we touch on that principle of vital health in her which made nothing that might by the common measure have been called one of the graver dilemmas, that is one of the checks to the continuity of life, really matter. What this felicity most comes to in fact is that doing at any cost the work that lies to one's hand shines out again and yet again as the saving secret of the soul. She affirmed her freedom

right and left, but her most characteristic assertion of it throughout was just in the luxury of labour. The exhaustive account we at any rate now enjoy of the family life surrounding her during the years here treated of and as she had constituted it, the picture of all the queer conflicting sensibilities engaged, and of the endless ramifications and reflections provided for these, leaves us nothing to learn on that congested air, that obstructive medium for the range of the higher tone, which the lady of Nohant was so at her 'objective' happiest, even if at her superficially, that is her nervously, most flurried and depressed, in bravely breasting. It is as if the conditions there and in Paris during these several years had been consistently appointed by fate to throw into relief the applications of a huge facility, a sort of universal readiness, with a rare intelligence to back it. Absolutely nothing was absent, or with all the data *could* have been, that might have bewildered a weaker genius into some lapse of eloquence or of industry; everything that might have overwhelmed, or at least have disconcerted, the worker who could throw off the splendid 'Lucrezia Floriani' in the thick of battle came upon her at once, inspiring her to show that on her system of health and cheer, of experiential economy, as we may call it, to be disconcerted was to be lost. To be lacerated and calumniated was in comparison a trifle; with a certain sanity of reaction these things became as naught, for the sanity of reaction was but the line of consistency, the theory and attitude of sincerity kept at the highest point. The artist in general, we need scarcely remind ourselves, is in a high degree liable to arrive at the sense of what he may have seen or felt, or said or suffered, by working it out as a subject, casting it into some form prescribed by his art; but even here he in general knows limits—unless perchance he be loose as Byron was loose, or possess such a power of disconnexion, such a clear stand-off of the intelligence, as accompanied the experiments of Goethe. Our own experiments, we commonly feel, are comparatively timid, just as we can scarce be said, in the homely phrase, to serve our æsthetic results of them hot and hot; we are too conscious of a restrictive instinct about the conditions we may, in like familiar language, let ourselves in for, there being always the question of

what we should be able 'intellectually' to show for them. The life of the author of 'Lucrezia Floriani' at its most active may fairly be described as an immunity from restrictive instincts more ably cultivated than any we know. Again and yet again we note the positive premium so put upon the surrender to sensibility, and how, since the latter was certain to spread to its maximum and to be admired in proportion to its spread, some surrender was always to have been worth while. 'Lucrezia Floriani' ought to have been rather measurably bad—lucidity, harmony, maturity, definiteness of sense, being so likely to fail it in the troubled air in which it was born. Yet how can we do less than applaud a composition throwing off as it goes such a passage as the splendid group of pages cited by Madame Karénine from the incident of the heroine's causing herself to be rowed over to the island in her Italian lake on that summer afternoon when the sense of her situation had become sharp for her to anguish, in order to take stock of the same without interruption and see, as we should say to-day, where she is? The whole thing has the grand manner and the noblest eloquence, reaching out as it does on the spot to the lesson and the moral of the convulsions that have been prepared in the first instance with such complacency, and illustrating in perfection the author's faculty for the clear re-emergence and the prompt or, as we may call it, the paying reaction. The case is put for her here as into its final nutshell: you may 'live' exactly as you like, that is live in perfect security and fertility, when such breadth of rendering awaits your simply sitting down to it. Is it not true, we say, that without her breadth our wonderful woman would have been 'nowhere'?—whereas with it she is effectively and indestructibly at any point of her field where she may care to pretend to stand.

This biographer, I must of course note, discriminates with delicacy among her heroine's felicities and mistakes, recognising that some of the former, as a latent awkwardness in them developed, inevitably parted with the signs that distinguished them from the latter; but I think we feel, as the instances multiply, that no regret could have equalled for us that of our not having the display vivid and complete. Once all the elements

of the scarce in advance imaginable were there it would have been a pity that they should not offer us the show of their full fruition. What more striking show, for example, than that, as recorded by Madame Karénine in a footnote, the afflicted parent of Solange should have lived to reproduce, or rather, as she would herself have said, to 'arrange' the girlish character and conduct of that young person, so humiliating at the time to any near relation, let alone a mother, in the novel of 'Mademoiselle Merquem,' where the truth to the original facts and the emulation of the graceless prime 'effects' are such as our author can vouch for? The fiction we name followed indeed after long years, but during the lifetime of the displeasing daughter and with an ease of reference to the past that may fairly strike us as the last word of superiority to blighting association. It is quite as if the close and amused matching of the character and its play in the novel with the wretched old realities, those that had broken in their day upon the scared maternal vision, had been a work of ingenuity attended with no pang. The example is interesting as a measure of the possible victory of time in a case where we might have supposed the one escape to have been by forgetting. Madame Sand remembers to the point of gratefully—gratefully as an artist—reconstituting; we in fact feel her, as the irrepressible, the 'healthy' artist, positively to enjoy so doing. Thus it clearly defined itself for her in the fulness of time that, humiliating, to use our expression, as the dreadful Solange might have been and have incessantly remained, she herself had never in the least consented to the stupidity or sterility of humiliation. So it could be that the free mind and the free hand were ever at her service. A beautiful indifferent agility, a power to cast out that was at least proportioned to the power to take in, hangs about all this and meets us in twenty connexions. Who of her readers has forgotten the harmonious dedication—her inveterate dedications have always, like her clear light prefaces, the last grace—of 'Jeanne,' so anciently, so romantically readable, to her faithful Berrichon servant who sits spinning by the fire? 'Vous ne savez pas lire, ma paisible amie,' but that was not to prevent the association of her name with the book, since both her own daughter and the author's are

in happy possession of the art and will be able to pass the entertainment on to her. This in itself is no more than a sign of the writer's fine democratic ease, which she carried at all times to all lengths, and of her charming habit of speech; but it somehow becomes further illustrational, testifying for the manner in which genius, if it be but great enough, lives its life at small cost, when we learn that after all, by a turn of the hand, the 'paisible amie' was, under provocation, bundled out of the house as if the beautiful relation had not meant half of what appeared. Françoise and her presence were dispensed with, but the exquisite lines remain, which we would not be without for the world.

The various situations determined for the more eminent of George Sand's intimate associates would always be independently interesting, thanks to the intrinsic appeal of these characters and even without the light reflected withal on the great agent herself; which is why poor Chopin's figuration in the events of the year 1847, as Madame Karénine so fully reconstitutes them, is all that is wanted to point their almost nightmare quality. Without something of a close view of them we fail of a grasp of our heroine's genius—her genius for keeping her head in deep seas morally and reflectively above water, though but a glance at them must suffice us for averting this loss. The old-world quality of drama, which throughout so thickens and tones the air around her, finds remarkable expression in the whole picture of the moment. Every connexion involved bristles like a conscious consequence, tells for all it is worth, as we say, and the sinister complexity of reference—for all the golden clearings-up that awaited it on the ideal plane—leaves nothing to be desired. The great and odd sign of the complications and convulsions, the alarms and excursions recorded, is that these are all the more or less direct fruits of sensibility, which had primarily been indulged in, under the doom of a preparation of them which no preparation of anything else was to emulate, with a good faith fairly touching in presence of the eventual ugliness. Madame Sand's wonderful mother, commemorated for us in 'L'Histoire de ma Vie' with the truth surely attaching in a like degree to no mother in

all the literature of so-called confession, had had for cousin a 'fille entretenue' who had married a mechanic. This Adèle Brault had had in the course of her adventures a daughter in whom, as an unfortunate young relative, Madame Dupin had taken an interest, introducing her to the heiress of Nohant, who viewed her with favour—she appears to have been amiable and commendable—and eventually associated her with her own children. She was thus the third member of that illegitimate progeny with which the Nohant scene was to have become familiar, George Sand's natural brother on her father's side and her natural sister on her mother's representing this element from the earlier time on. The young Augustine, fugitive from a circle still less edifying, was thus made a companion of the son and the daughter of the house, and was especially held to compare with the latter to her great advantage in the matter of character, docility and temper. These young persons formed, as it were, with his more distinguished friend, the virtual family of Chopin during those years of specifically qualified domestication which affect us as only less of a mystification to taste than that phase of the unrestricted which had immediately preceded them. Hence a tangled tissue of relations within the circle that became, as it strikes us, indescribable for difficulty and 'delicacy,' not to say for the perfection of their impracticability, and as to which the great point is that Madame Sand's having taken them so robustly for granted throws upon her temperamental genius a more direct light than any other. The whole case belongs doubtless even more to the hapless history of Chopin himself than to that of his terrible friend—terrible for her power to flourish in conditions sooner or later fatal to weaker vessels; but is in addition to this one of the most striking illustrations possible of that view or theory of social life handed over to the reactions of sensibility almost alone, which, while ever so little the ideal of the Anglo-Saxon world, has largely governed the manners of its sister societies. It has been our view, very emphatically, in general, that the sane and active social body—or, for that matter, the sane and active individual, addressed to the natural business of life—goes wrongly about it to *encourage* sensibility, or to do anything on the whole but treat it as

of no prime importance; the traps it may lay for us, however, being really of the fewest in a race to which the very imagination of it may be said, I think, to have been comparatively denied. The imagination of it sat irremovably, on the other hand, and as a matter of course, at the Nohant fireside; where indeed we find the play and the ravage chiefly interesting through our thus seeing the delicate Chopin, whose semi-smothered appeal remains peculiarly pathetic, all helpless and foredoomed at the centre of the whirl. Nothing again strikes us more in the connexion than the familiar truth that interesting persons make everything that concerns them interesting, or seldom fail to redeem from what might in another air seem but meanness and vanity even their most compromised states and their greatest wastes of value. Every one in the particular Nohant drama here exposed loses by the exposure—so far as loss could be predicated of amounts which, in general, excepting the said sensibility, were so scant among them; every one, that is, save the ruling spirit of all, with the extraordinary mark in her of the practical defiance of waste and of her inevitable enrichment, for our measure, as by reflection from the surrounding shrinkage. One of the oddest aspects of the scene is also one of the wretchedest, but the oddity makes it interesting, by the law I just glanced at, in spite of its vulgar side. How could it not be interesting, we ask as we read, to feel that Chopin, though far from the one man, was the one gentleman of the association, the finest set of nerves and scruples, and yet to see how little that availed him, in exasperated reactions, against mistakes of perverted sympathy? It is relevant in a high degree to our view of his great protectress as reducible at her best to male terms that she herself in this very light fell short, missed the ideal safeguard which for her friend had been preinvolved—as of course may be the danger, ever, with the creature so transmuted, and as is so strikingly exemplified, in the pages before us, when Madame Karénine ingenuously gives us chapter and verse for her heroine's so unqualified demolition of the person of Madame d'Agoult, devotee of Liszt, mother to be, by that token, of Richard Wagner's second wife, and sometime intimate of the author of 'Isidora,' in which fiction we are shown the parody

perpetrated. If women rend each other on occasion with sharper talons than seem to belong on the whole to the male hand, however intently applied, we find ourselves reflect, parenthetically, that the loss of this advantage may well be a matter for them to consider when the new approximation is the issue.

The great sign of the Nohant circle, on all this showing, at any rate, is the intense personalism, as we may call it, reigning there, or in other words the vivacity, the acuity and irritability of the personal relations—which flourished so largely, we at the same time feel, by reason of the general gift for expression, that gift to which we owe the general superiority of every letter, from it scarce matters whom, laid under contribution by our author. How could people not feel with acuity when they could, when they had to, write with such point and such specific intelligence?—just indeed as one asks how letters could fail to remain at such a level among them when they incessantly generated choice matter for expression. Madame Sand herself is of course on this ground easily the most admirable, as we have seen; but every one ‘knows how’ to write, and does it well in proportion as the matter in hand most demands and most rewards proper saying. Much of all this stuff of history seems indeed to have been susceptible of any amount of force of statement; yet we note all the while how in the case of the great mistress of the pen at least some shade of intrinsic beauty attends even the presentation of quite abominable facts. We can only see it as abominable, at least, so long as we have Madame Sand’s words—which are somehow a different thing from her word—for it, that Chopin had from the first ‘sided’ with the atrocious Solange in that play of her genius which is characterised by our chronicler as wickedness for the sake of wickedness, as art for the sake of art, without other logic or other cause. ‘Once married,’ says Madame Karénine, ‘she made a double use of this wickedness. She had always hated Augustine; she wished, one doesn’t know why, to break off her marriage, and by calumnies and insinuations she succeeded. Then angry with her mother she avenged herself on her as well by further calumnies. Thereupon took place at Nohant such events that’—that in fine we

stop before them with this preliminary shudder. The cross-currents of violence among them would take more keeping apart than we have time for, the more that everything comes back, for interest, to the intrinsic weight of the tone of the principal sufferer from them—as we see her, as we wouldn't for the world not see her, in spite of the fact that Chopin was to succumb scarce more than a year later to multiplied lacerations, and that she was to override, and reproduce and pre-appointedly flourish for long years after. If it is interesting, as I have pronounced it, that Chopin, again, should have consented to be of the opinion of Solange that the relations between her brother Maurice and the hapless Augustine were of the last impropriety, I fear I can account no better for this than by our sense that the more the *genius loci* has to feed her full tone the more our faith in it, as such a fine thing in itself, is justified. Almost immediately after the precipitated marriage of the daughter of the house has taken place, the Clésinger couple, avid and insolent, of a breadth of old time impudence in fact of which our paler day has lost the pattern, are back on the mother's hands, to the effect of a vividest picture of Maurice well-nigh in a death-grapple with his apparently quite monstrous 'bounder' of a brother-in-law, a picture that further gives us Madame Sand herself smiting Clésinger in the face and receiving from him a blow in the breast, while Solange 'coldly,' with an iciness, indeed, peculiarly her own, fans the rage and approves her husband's assault, and while the divine composer, though for that moment much in the background, approves the wondrous approval. He still approves, to all appearance, the daughter's interpretation of the mother's wish to 'get rid' of him as the result of an amorous design on the latter's part in respect of a young man lately introduced to the circle as Maurice's friend, and for the intimate relation with whom it is thus desirable that the coast shall be made clear. How else than through no fewer consistencies of the unedifying on the part of these provokers of the expressional reaction should we have come by innumerable fine epistolary passages, passages constituting in themselves verily such adornments of the tale, such notes in the scale of all the

damaged dignity redressed, that we should be morally the poorer without them? One of the vividest glimpses indeed is not in a letter, but in a few lines from 'L'Histoire de ma Vie,' the composition of which was begun toward the end of this period and while its shadow still hung about—early in life for a projected autobiography, inasmuch as the author had not then reached her forty-fifth year. Chopin at work, improvising and composing, was apt to become a prey to doubts and depressions, so that there were times when to break in upon these was to render him a service.

'But it was not always possible to induce him to leave the piano, often so much more his torment than his joy, and he began gradually to resent my proposing he should do so. I never ventured on these occasions to insist. Chopin in displeasure was appalling, and as with me he always controlled himself it was as if he might die of suffocation.'

It is a vision of the possibilities of vibration in such organisms that does in fact appal, and with the clash of vibrations, those both of genius and of the general less sanctioned sensibility, the air must have more than sufficiently resounded. Some eight years after the beginning of their friendship and the year after the final complete break in it she writes to Madame Pauline Viardot:

'Do you see Chopin? Tell me about his health. I have been unable to repay his fury and his hatred by hatred and fury. I think of him as of a sick, embittered, bewildered child. I saw much of Solange in Paris,' the letter goes on, 'and made her my constant occupation, but without finding anything but a stone in the place of her heart. I have taken up my work again while waiting for the tide to carry me elsewhere.'

All the author's 'authority' is in these few words, and in none more than in the glance at the work and the tide. The work and the tide rose ever as high as she would to float her, and wherever we look there is always the authority. 'I find Chopin *magnificent*,' she had already written from the thick of the fray, 'to keep seeing, frequenting and approving Clésinger, who struck me because I snatched from his hands the hammer he had raised upon Maurice—Chopin whom every one talks

of as my most faithful and devoted friend.' Well indeed may our biographer have put it that from a certain date in May 1847 'the two *Leitmotive* which might have been called in the terms of Wagner the *Leitmotif* of soreness and the *Leitmotif* of despair—Chopin, Solange—sound together now in fusion, now in a mutual grip, now simply side by side, in all Madame Sand's unpublished letters and in the few (of the moment) that have been published. A little later a third joins in—Augustine Brault, a motive narrowly and tragically linked to the *basso obbligato* of Solange.' To meet such a passage as the following under our heroine's hand again is to feel the whole temper of intercourse implied slip straight out of our analytic grasp. The allusion is to Chopin and to the 'defection' of which he had been guilty, to her view at the time when it had been most important that she might count on him. What we have first, as outsiders, to swallow down, as it were, is the state of things, the hysteric pitch of family life, in which any ideal of reticence, any principle, as we know it, of minding one's business, for mere dignity's sake if for none other, had undergone such collapse.

'I grant you I am not sorry that he has withdrawn from me the government of his life, for which both he and his friends wanted to make me responsible in so much too absolute a fashion. His temper kept growing in asperity, so that it had come to his constantly blowing me up, from spite, ill-humour and jealousy, in presence of my friends and my children. Solange made use of it with the astuteness that belongs to her, while Maurice began to give way to indignation. Knowing and seeing *la chasteté de nos rapports*, he saw also that the poor sick soul took up, without *wanting to* and perhaps without being able to help it, the attitude of the lover, the husband, the proprietor of my thoughts and actions. He was on the point of breaking out and telling him to his face that he was making me play, at forty-three years of age, a ridiculous part, and that it was an abuse of my kindness, my patience and my pity for his nervous morbid state. A few months more, a few days perhaps, of this situation, and an impossible frightful struggle would have broken out between them. Foreseeing the storm, I took advantage of Chopin's predilections for Solange and left him to sulk, without an effort to bring him round. We have not for

three months exchanged a word in writing, and I don't know how such a cooling-off will end.'

She develops the picture of the extravagance of his sick irritability; she accepts with indifference the certainty that his friends will accuse her of having cast him out to take a lover; the one thing she 'minds' is the force of evil in her daughter, who is the centre of all the treachery. 'She will come back to me when she needs me, that I know. But her return will be neither tender nor consoling.' Therefore it is when at the beginning of the winter of this same dreadful year she throws off the free rich summary of what she has been through in the letter to M. Charles Poncy already published in her Correspondence we are swept into the current of sympathy and admiration. The preceding months had been the heaviest and most painful of her life.

'I all but broke down under them utterly, though I had for long seen them coming. But you know how one is not always overhung by the evil portent, however clear one may read it—there are days, weeks, even whole months, when one lives on illusion and fondly hopes to divert the blow that threatens. It is always at last the most probable ill that surprises us unarmed and unprepared. To this explosion of unhappy underground germs joined themselves sundry contributive matters, bitter things too and quite unexpected; so that I am broken by grief in body and soul. I believe my grief incurable; for I never succeed in throwing it off for a few hours without its coming upon me again during the next in greater force and gloom. I nevertheless struggle against it without respite and if I don't hope for a victory which would have to consist of not feeling at all, at least I have reached that of still bearing with life, of even scarcely feeling ill, of having recovered my taste for work and of not showing my distress. I have got back outside calm and cheer, which are so necessary for others, and everything in my life seems to go on well.'

We had already become aware, through commemorations previous to the present, of that first or innermost line of defence residing in George Sand's splendid mastery of the letter, the gift that was always so to assure her, on every issue, the enjoyment of the first chance with posterity. The mere cerebral and manual activity represented by the quantity no less than the quality of her

outflow through the post at a season when her engagements were most pressing and her anxieties of every sort most cruel is justly qualified by Madame Karénine as astounding; the new letters here given to the world heaping up the exhibition and testifying even beyond the finest of those gathered in after the writer's death—the mutilations, suppressions and other freedoms then used, for that matter, being now exposed. If no plot of her most bustling fiction ever thickened at the rate at which those agitations of her inner circle at which we have glanced multiplied upon her hands through the later 'forties, so we are tempted to find her rather less in possession of her great *moyens* when handling the artificial presentation than when handling what we may call the natural. It is not too much to say that the long letter addressed to the cynical Solange in April '52, and which these pages give us *in extenso*, would have made the fortune of any mere interesting 'story' in which one of the characters might have been presented as writing it. It is a document of the highest psychological value and a practical summary of all the elements of the writer's genius, of all her indefeasible advantages; it is verily the gem of her biographer's collection. Taken in connexion with a copious communication to her son, of the previous year, on the subject of his sister's character and vices, and of their common experience of these, it offers, in its ease of movement, its extraordinary frankness and lucidity, its splendid apprehension and interpretation of realities, its state, as it were, of saturation with these, exactly the kind of interest for which her novels were held remarkable, but in a degree even above their maximum. Such a letter is an effusion of the highest price; none of a weight so baffling to estimation was probably ever inspired in a mother by solicitude for a clever daughter's possibilities. Never surely had an accomplished daughter laid under such contribution a mother of high culture; never had such remarkable and pertinent things had to flow from such a source; never in fine was so urgent an occasion so admirably, so inimitably risen to. Marvellous through it all is the way in which, while a common recognition of the 'facts of life,' as between two perfectly intelligent men of the world, gives the whole diapason, the abdication of moral

authority and of the rights of wisdom never takes place. The tone is a high implication of the moral advantages that Solange had inveterately enjoyed and had decided none the less to avail herself of so little; which advantages we absolutely believe in as we read—*there* is the prodigious part: such an education of the soul, and in fact of every faculty, such a claim for the irreproachable, it would fairly seem, do we feel any association with the great fluent artist, in whatever conditions taking place, inevitably, necessarily to have been. If we put ourselves questions we yet wave away doubts, and with whatever remnants of prejudice the writer's last word may often have to clash, our own is that there is nothing for grand final rightness like a sufficiently *general* humanity—when a particularly beautiful voice happens to serve it.

HENRY JAMES.

Art. 3.—THE CARNOT FAMILY.

1. *Address of Professor H. L. Callendar to the British Association (Physical Section) at Dundee, September, 1912.* London: Murray, 1913.
2. *Réflexions sur la puissance motrice du feu.* Par Sadi N. L. Carnot (facsimile reissue). Paris: Hermann, 1912.
3. *Mémoires sur Lazare Carnot.* Par Hippolyte Carnot. Illustrated edition. Paris: Hachette, 1912.
4. *Carnot, Comte L. N. M. Correspondance générale.* Par E. Charavay. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1892-1912.

It is a coincidence that, at the moment when Prof. Callendar was expounding to the British Association in September, 1912, the daring originality of Sadi Carnot's speculations on the theory of heat, there was issuing from the press of the Librairie Hermann a facsimile reprint of the little duodecimo of 1824 in which the young lieutenant summarised his researches. And, as if to remind us that Sadi was not the only one of his race who perished untimely, comes a reprint of the 'Éloge' which M. Poincaré pronounced before the monument erected to President Sadi Carnot, who fell at Lyons in 1894. Half consciously one looks back a hundred years to find yet another Carnot, the great Lazare, organising victory in four campaigns at once, and with the civil power at his disposal if only he had chosen to assume the dictatorship. Here surely, in this direct succession of capacity, is something worthy of closer study. The family name of Carnot has now been borne by four generations of pre-eminently capable men. It is a record which few if any other families can equal. Perhaps the Bernoullis approach nearest to it; for nearly a hundred years they were never without a representative of original mathematical talent. But the Carnot mind, while decidedly of a mathematical bent, was much wider in scope. It proved itself capable of displaying its powers in the battlefield, in the council chamber, on the platform, in the laboratory, and in the work of legislative construction.

The family had been settled since the 15th century at Nolay, in Burgundy, that terrestrial paradise

which gave to man the vintages of Vougeot and Chambertin. In this fruitful spot one observes without surprise their pedigree adorned with families of ten, twelve, and fourteen members; and here, between the years 1750 and 1770, Margaret, the wife of Claude Carnot, gave birth to fourteen children. As each child came into the world its birth was recorded on the blank leaf at the end of a Summary of the Institutes of Justinian. As the entries grew in number the handwriting diminished in size, but the record stretched to the cover of the volume, and there was barely room for the grandson to record in 1836 the death of his last uncle.

Claude Carnot was by profession an advocate and notary. His grandson Hippolyte, describing him as he appeared in his seventy-ninth year, says he looked like a man of forty, walking erect with firm step and reading without glasses, his mind as alert and vigorous as his body. Margaret, his wife, died at the age of sixty-two, so suddenly that only one of her children was able to say good-bye to her. There was, however, no constitutional defect to account for this early death; doubtless the frame was worn out. To the last she appeared to her children graceful, stately, tender and loving.

Of her fourteen children, six sons and one daughter attained maturity; and they all bore the mark of distinction. Without exception they seem to have combined the physical vigour and the mental capacity of the father with the personal beauty and grace of the mother. The eldest surviving daughter, Jeanne Pierette, was for fifty-two years Lady Superior of the Hospital of Charity at Nolay. Her sister Marguerite, dying young, had bequeathed to her the title '*mère des pauvres*,' which she worthily sustained till it was inscribed on her tombstone. After the mother's death all her younger brothers seem to have looked up to Jeanne as to their mother, and she called them by the pet names they had borne in the nursery. Little as she sympathised with the republicanism of her brothers, there was no breach in the family affection. When Lazare had voted for the death of the king and organised the *levée en masse*, she still addressed him as '*le gentil*,' the name he had borne in childhood.

Of the six brothers all, with the exception of Lazare, attained the age of eighty. It is greatly to be regretted

that we have no detailed account of the manner of education of these sons. It was conducted by the father up to the point when it became specialised, two boys being destined for a military career and four for the law. That the training they received from their parents was impressive and efficient is shown by the strong intellectual likeness and the close personal sympathy which subsisted between the brothers. They had all learned the vital lesson of interesting themselves in everything—politics and business, nature and science, literature and art.

There is one little incident related of the childhood of Lazare which illustrates the kind of mind that was developing. He was ten years old when his mother took him for the first time to the theatre at Dijon. One scene represented the siege of a walled town, the besieging forces approaching with their artillery. Young Lazare followed the action closely and with growing excitement, until suddenly he rose from his seat and shouted to the commander, 'Move your guns, they are badly placed; don't you see the gunners will all be killed by the first shot from the fort? I can see them getting ready to fire. Put the gunners behind that rock.' Doubtless Madame Carnot suffered agonies of shame from the uproarious mirth of pit and gallery, but she may well have reflected afterwards that there was probably something in a boy who could thus clearly realise the defective points of a situation and thus intensely desire to put them right. Something also is to be learned from a family incident of the year 1769, when Claude would have been about fourteen years old. Thinking he had something to complain of, he announced his intention of leaving home. The parents suffered him to go without protest, and the boy remained away a whole month. When he returned and took his place quietly at the supper-table, the conversation went on as though nothing had happened. He was never reproached for his escapade, nor was any reference ever made to it.

Of the four brothers who were destined for the law, one became a judge of the Court of Cassation and published a Commentary on the Penal Code and on the Procedure in the Court of Final Appeal which remained for long the standard authority. Two attained the position of Judge and Procureur of Departments, and one

continued the notarial practice of his father. History concerns itself mainly with the two brothers Lazare and Claude Marie-Feulint, who were destined to a career in the Corps du Génie, Vauban's creation for the maintenance of a highly trained body of officers devoted to the scientific attack and defence of fortified places.

Of all the brothers Feulint appears to have reproduced most completely the physical vigour of his father with the beauty of his mother. He is described as graceful and charming in demeanour, and of singularly beautiful countenance. His social qualities were such as to make him the idol of Parisian salons, while his oratory captivated the Convention. His bodily constitution enabled him to endure labours which would have worn out others, and then to enjoy a healthy and vigorous old age. His military exploits, both in organisation and in the field, were so closely connected with those of Lazare that chroniclers of the time constantly confound the two. Sometimes he stands out separately, as in his courageous indictment of Lafayette, and in his strenuous opposition to Napoleon during his brother's retirement; but in the main his work was directed to the task of reorganising the army, reconstructing the staff, and preventing friction between the civil power and the military. His reports to the National Assembly in 1791, on the reconstitution of the Royal Guard and of the gendarmerie, were published, and his recommendations were adopted. It was largely through his exertions that there arose that superb army which was to raise Napoleon to power.

Feulint would have been better known to history but for the more brilliant career of his brother Lazare, through whom the mental endowments of old Claude of Nolay were to be transmitted to future generations. Before the death of the gentle Marguerite in 1788, she was already assured that Lazare's childish outburst in the theatre had really meant something. At that time his *Éloge* on Vauban had been crowned by the Academy of Dijon and had procured from Prince Henry of Prussia an offer of high rank in the army of the great Frederick. Thirteen years later, when Claude followed his wife to the grave, he had seen all his children occupying positions of dignity and influence; two of them were regarded as

the Saviours of the Republic, and one had been offered and had refused the sole supreme rule in the State.

Lazare's career best illustrates the quality of the family intellect which he inherited and transmitted. His conduct at the battle of Wattignies was the action which most strongly impressed his contemporaries. He won the battle in an outburst of enthusiasm like that by which he petrified the theatrical audience. He had given instructions to Jourdan to attempt the impossible, and he went himself to the front as Commissioner to see his plan carried out. By a rapid concentration of troops from north and south he confronted Coburg's army before Maubeuge. The first day's engagement was indecisive. Then in the night under cover of fog he concentrated all his forces on the extreme right and placed the artillery under his brother Feulint in position to turn Coburg's flank. At daybreak he directed Jourdan to advance. The recruits, exhausted by three days' marching and a sleepless night, were scarcely a match for Coburg's troops. The Gratien brigade wavered and began to fall back. Seeing this, Lazare galloped to the head of the brigade, superseded Gratien in the face of the troops, leaped from his horse, reformed the lines and led the brigade himself. At this moment, Feulint opened fire with his battery of twelve guns on the flank of the Austrian cavalry. His fire was accurate and overwhelming in its effect; the horse were thrown into confusion; demoralisation spread to the main body of the troops; and the Austrian retreat ended in a rout. On the following day the fortress of Maubeuge was relieved, and the tide of the revolutionary war was turned. Napoleon, who had carefully studied the early campaigns of the French revolutionary forces, long afterwards at St Helena spoke of Wattignies as the finest victory of all, and added, 'Do you know who did this? It was Carnot.'

So far as appears from this episode, it might seem that the mind of Lazare Carnot was essentially the mind of a brilliant officer of brigade. As a fact that was merely a small part of his mental activity. He was much more a strategist than a soldier, and the unknown voice from the gallery which acclaimed him as 'Organisateur de la Victoire' justly estimated his work in that capacity. One of his colleagues on the Committee of Public Safety

has left an interesting record of his manner of work. One corner of the table round which the Committee sat was appropriated to Lazare and his maps and papers; and there he sat all day, and frequently half the night, measuring, planning, and writing instructions to the generals in the field. His work was never interrupted; he let his colleagues talk on, and only interposed a word or two before their discussion ended, but the word was frequently vital and modified the ultimate decision. What he accomplished from that table-corner in the Tuileries is a matter of history. In the first year he organised and equipped one great army on the Rhine, another on the Belgian frontier, a third on the Pyrenees; constructing them, moreover, out of raw peasant material judiciously welded into the old troops. In the second year, the three armies had become fourteen, and he manœuvred them as though they had been fourteen units of a single army. Nor was his work confined to supervision and general directions; his instructions to his generals were detailed and particular. The later campaign in Italy, which Bonaparte afterwards carried out, is set forth in detail in Carnot's instructions to Schérer; and the capture of the icebound Dutch fleet by a cavalry raid was suggested in a despatch which he wrote to the representative with Pichegru's army.

Combined with his power of bringing all his faculties to bear on whatever he touched, there was an entire absence of ambition, amounting almost to disregard of the opinions of his fellow men. Prieur notes that he seldom gave himself the pleasure of announcing to the Convention the result of his labours. He remained at his work while Robespierre or Couthon announced to the Assembly the long catalogue of his achievements. When he did attend the word 'I' never appeared in his discourse; it was always the Committee who had planned, the generals who had directed, the soldiers who had achieved. The fact that Lazare Carnot told them what to do and saw that they had the means of doing it, was left to the inference of those who were able to draw conclusions.

That the best minds in France were able to draw the conclusion is apparent from the earnestness with which in the summer of 1797 he was pressed from all sides to assume a dictatorship. It is perhaps no great credit to

his political insight that he refused, but his reason for refusing is intelligible; he thought that a military dictatorship had become inevitable, but his repugnance to assuming that position himself was so intense that he preferred voluntary exile. Lord Brougham said truly of him, 'After a life of more power and splendour than usually falls to the lot of absolute monarchs, he devoted himself to those profound researches in the higher branches of mathematics which have rendered his name as conspicuous in the scientific as it is in the political world. . . . This is indeed a reach of public virtue approaching to the grandeur of the ideal character.'

Brougham was not alone in admiration of Lazare Carnot's achievements. Dumouriez and Jomini both eulogised him as the creator of an entirely new strategy. Lagrange praised his mathematical writings and even went so far as to say that his own Theory of Functions had been anticipated by Lazare Carnot's earlier work. This expression must not be taken too literally. It was doubtless prompted by the recollection that Lagrange owed his safety and his position to the sheltering hand of Carnot, who, when he was included in the proscription, had procured him an appointment specially for the purpose of 'pursuing his researches into the theory of projectiles.' Finally, among Napoleon's last utterances on French soil were one or two which show the impression that Carnot had made on him. 'I have known you too late,' he said to Carnot himself after Waterloo; and a few days later before embarking on the 'Bellerophon' he gave this parting message to Boulay, 'Surtout dites bien à Carnot qu'il est un homme adorable.'

Of the scientific side of Lazare Carnot's mind it is impossible to treat here as fully as it deserves. It is important both in itself and as representing a side of his activity which reappeared, with even more striking results, in his son. Suffice it to say that in his Theory of Machines he extended the principle of Least Action, which he had learned from his teachers D'Alembert and Gaspard Monge, into something closely resembling the modern doctrine of energy; and in discussing the loss of power occasioned by sudden changes of velocity he gave a new application to the Calculus of Variations and established a principle which long continued to bear his

name. The mind revealed in this book appears of a geometrical rather than an analytical turn ; it shows something of the power possessed by Newton and Faraday, the power of realising conclusions not yet capable of exact expression in words or figures. Yet his mastery over analytical methods was considerable ; and the Reflections on the Metaphysic of the Infinitesimal Calculus suggests that, if his whole powers had been devoted to mathematics, he might have ranked with his great contemporaries Laplace and Lagrange, and have given his name to some wider generalisation than the Carnot Theory of Transversals which is familiar to students of the conic sections.

His interest in the inventions of others is noteworthy. In 1784, shortly after the first experiments of Mongolfier, he communicated to the Academy of Science a paper on dirigible balloons. He discussed the problems of the propulsion and the steerage of such a body, and arrived at the conclusion that propulsion must be secured by a wheel kept in revolution by a heat-engine. His paper contained the prophecy that, perhaps within ten years, the heat-engine might be so far improved as to produce a revolution in manufactures. In the very year of Carnot's paper Watt took out his patent for the sun and planet attachment, which enabled his steam engine to produce rotary motion. Let us add that within ten years Carnot was able to utilise the captive balloon for the first time in warfare on the field of Fleurus, and that he was able to persuade the Convention to establish a School of Aerostation at Meudon. When his colleagues on the Institute reproached him with constituting himself the patron '*des inventions téméraires*,' he replied, '*Inventive genius is so rare and precious that I go out to meet it whenever I see or hear of it.*'

Thus his main bent was scientific, with a passion for enquiry and research ; but he is not to be classed as a man of science any more than as a man of war. His capacities were not limited in any direction save by the bounds of human endurance. He took an interest in everything, but above all in the welfare of his own people ; and in his later life, when Napoleon called upon him to help France, the task he chose for himself was not the defence of the frontiers, but the organisation of primary

education. In his voluntary exile he had devoted himself to the education of his sons Sadi and Hippolyte. There does not appear to have been any special peculiarity about his mode of training. It was miscellaneous and continuous, never at high pressure but never ceasing. The boys had always to be doing something, helping their father to translate Horace, gathering botanical specimens in the hedges, studying literature as well as science. They were evidently encouraged to take a lively interest in whatever they did, and to be constantly occupied.

Sadi's career is specially noteworthy. At sixteen he went to the École Polytechnique, being intended for a career in the artillery. But the Bourbon restoration marred his chances of promotion; he became a lieutenant in the Staff corps, and wore out his brain and body with continuous study, varied by excessive athletics. He died of cholera, following brain-fever, at the age of thirty-six. But before his death he had published a little work of 120 duodecimo pages, which has affixed the name of Carnot for all time to the fundamental propositions of Thermo-dynamics.

The 'Réflexions sur la Puissance Motrice du Feu' remained unnoticed for more than twenty years after their publication, but in 1849 Sir William Thomson (Lord Kelvin) called attention to their originality and importance. More recently Prof. Callendar has examined closely the reasoning outlined in the notes to this little volume, as well as some of the MS. notes which Sadi left behind him; and in his address to the Physical Section of the British Association (September, 1912) he showed that Sadi Carnot had not merely established the fundamental dynamical principles of a heat-engine, but had in fact arrived at the Mechanical Equivalent of heat and had anticipated the very processes by which Joule, Rankine and Kelvin afterwards ascertained it. In fact, the whole of the modern Science of Energetics is contained in the notes to this little volume. There is nothing quite comparable to this achievement except perhaps Newton's optics. Just as Newton started from a generally received but false conception—the emission or corpuscular theory—and yet so handled it as to produce a complete body of vigorous doctrine leading to correct results, so Sadi Carnot, starting from the generally received but false

conception of Caloric as an imponderable fluid, deduced a complete and perfect theory of a heat-engine. Moreover, just as Newton in the course of his investigation convinced himself that a corpuscular theory would have to give way to an undulatory theory, so Sadi Carnot convinced himself that Caloric was no fluid entity, but simply a name for a measure of heat-quantity.

Sadi had learned from his father something of the general principles of heat-engines. The task he set himself was to arrive at the best theoretical form of the heat-engine, and to ascertain whether better results could not be expected from the use of alcohol or other fuels. He ascertained and demonstrated that the motive power obtainable from a given quantity of heat is altogether independent of the source of supply, and depends on two factors only—the temperature generated at the source, and the temperature when the engine has returned to the position from which it started. In other words, it is some constant multiple or function of the difference between the higher temperature and the lower. But for this purpose it would be necessary to have some new measure of temperature. To this problem also Sadi Carnot was equal.

‘It was my privilege’ (says Prof. Callendar) ‘to discover a few years ago that Carnot himself had actually given the correct solution of this fundamental problem in one of his most important footnotes, where it had lain buried and unnoticed for more than eighty years. He showed by a most direct application of the caloric theory that, if temperature was measured on the scale of a perfect gas (which is now universally adopted), the value of his Function . . . would be the same at all temperatures and might be represented simply by a mechanical constant (our mechanical equivalent) depending on the units adopted for work and heat.’

The type of mind which could achieve these results long before there was any logical theory of heat and energy places the young lieutenant on the level of Faraday if not of Newton. All three foresaw what would be the problems of the future, and they had already invented the logic which was to solve those problems before their contemporaries were aware of the nature of the questions which would require solution.

Sadi's younger brother, Hippolyte, remained with his father until the death of the latter. He devoted himself for a time to the Saint Simonians, assisted in their journal and published some verse translations. In 1831 he became editor of the 'Revue Encyclopédique'; in 1839 he entered the Assembly as Deputy for Paris, and upon the Revolution of 1848 he became Minister of Education. He took up the work which his father had begun in 1815, and introduced a comprehensive proposal for universal free compulsory education in primary schools. The spirit of compromise which pervaded this proposal served to wreck the measure. His own supporters desired a purely secular system. Hippolyte proposed simple religious instruction based on the Apostles' Creed. Opposed both by the Catholic Right and the Secularist Left, he withdrew the measure and retired from office. The interlude of the Second Empire naturally excluded him from place or power; but in 1871 he was elected deputy for the Seine et Oise and in 1875 life Senator. His two sons both attained eminence. Marie Adolphe became Director of the École des Mines; and his chemical researches have given him a European reputation. As for the other son, Marie François Sadi, one of Hippolyte's last acts in his eighty-eighth year was to call at the Élysée to congratulate him on his elevation to the Presidency of the French Republic. With the good humour which was traditional in the race, he said, 'Now you are the head of the family; you will sign yourself Carnot—*tout court*.'

The career of Marie François Sadi had been first that of a civil engineer. During the war of 1870 Gambetta had appointed him Commissioner in the Lower Seine. He had constructed the defences of Havre and had designed an improved mitrailleuse. He became an enthusiastic follower of the English Philosophical Radicals and translated some of Stuart Mill's shorter works. In 1871 he definitely adopted a political life. He was elected Deputy for the Côte d'Or, was Minister of Public Works in three successive administrations, and in 1885 became Finance Minister. The finances of the State were in great disorder; corruption had crept into the Public Services; the Panama enterprise was languishing towards extinction; periodic deficits had accumulated to an alarming extent. François Sadi justified his appointment.

He dismissed the reptile commission-hunters who had gathered round the President's son-in-law, and he laid before the Assembly a Budget of truly heroic proportions. It was the first time that financial truth and honesty had been outspoken since the *débâcle*. But the reorganisation of the national finances was on too large a scale to meet with acceptance; and the Budget was defeated, as was a similar proposal in the following year. For the time being, the efforts of the Finance Minister resulted only in increasing the public disorder by ensuring an exposure of the Wilson scandals.

But there was a general feeling that Carnot was the man to save the Republic; and, when Grévy fell, he was elected President by 616 votes against 188, Ferry retiring in his favour. When he took office, the Republic was menaced by a host of enemies, and the Government was involved in countless difficulties owing to the alarm and anger excited by the Wilson prosecutions, the utter collapse of the Panama Company, the Boulanger conspiracies, the anarchist outbreaks associated with the names of Ravachol, Meunier and Vaillant, perhaps above all the constant pressure of accumulating deficit and financial instability. That these troubles were overcome is the measure of Carnot's success. The seven years of his Presidency were the crisis of the Third Republic; and there were times when no good judge would have staked his reputation on its continuance. But every one of these crises was surmounted with an increase of popular respect and admiration for the President; and when, on June 24, 1894, he perished at Lyons under the dagger of Caserio, he left the Republic firmly established. In 1889 he had had the satisfaction of presiding at the removal of his grandfather's remains from Magdeburg to the Panthéon, and his own ashes now lie beside them.

M. Poincaré, who, as a member of the Ribot Cabinet, was brought into close contact with President Carnot, was chosen to pronounce the oration over his monument, on Sept. 8, 1895. Naturally perhaps he dwelt at greatest length on the international aspect, on the fact that he had found France isolated, friendless, torn by internal dissensions, and with financial credit impaired, and he had left her restored to her rightful position in the Concert of Europe. It was undoubtedly the Russian

Alliance which seemed at the moment the greatest triumph of the President, but it may be that in future the influence he exerted on the minds of his own countrymen will seem even more important. At his death, for the first time since 1870, faction was laid low and the Republic became really one and indivisible.

The President's surviving brother Adolphe has maintained the family tradition of scientific ability. His researches in mineral analysis are known throughout Europe, and have recently been collected and published in four volumes. What is more important to remark is that he has maintained the family tradition of many-sided capacity, for he occupies at the present time the positions of Chairman of the Paris Gas Company and President of that important political association, 'L'Alliance Républicaine Démocratique.' Both of his sons are already making their reputation, one in medical and the other in physical science.

Of the late President's sons the eldest holds office as Premier President at Dijon and as Chairman of the Viscose Company; the second is a recognised authority on military history; two others have sat in the Chamber as deputies for the departments of the Côte d'Or and the Seine et Oise, and one of these has lately been elected President of the 'Union des Arts Décoratifs.' When we reflect that during the period of a hundred and fifty years there has never been wanting some one of the lineage of Carnot ready and competent to fill the highest offices to which the State might call him, the question arises, What kind of capacity is that which has thus been transmitted for five generations? What kind of brain is this which defies the rules of probability and refuses to descend to the average?

The question admits of a partial answer. As we look over the record of this family mind and contemplate the wide range of its activities, we see at once what this brain is not. It is in no sense the brain of the virtuoso or the pedant. There is here no abnormal development of one set of activities to the exclusion or enfeeblement of others, but rather the extension, evenly in all directions, of every activity which the ordinary human brain is capable of exercising. At Nolay, in front of the Maison Carnot, is a superb statue of Lazare in which the sculptor

Rouleau seems to have embodied in stone the living image of this great intellectual type, the man who thinks with his whole being and grasps every object of attention through and by means of every possible outlet of nervous energy at one and the same moment. To look at the upper part of the face, you might suppose him absorbed in reverie, but a glance at the whole bodily frame shows that cogitation is leading direct to action. The lips are framing a word; the right hand is moving over the chart, the left hand adjusts the compasses; the pose and balance of the body indicate a forward step definitely chosen.

The Carnot type of mind is then no prodigy; it is the normal brain invigorated from childhood upwards by constant and varied exercise in all directions. And it would seem, from all the indications we can glean, that this was indeed the method of education pursued in the home at Nolay and at Presles. The education of the Carnot sons was directed not to the finding of an imagined bent or inclination, and the forcing of that to the neglect of everything else, but to the encouragement of an active and incessant interest in everything. Morally the notes of this character are good humour and perfect courage. The grace and charm with which Carnot-Feulint smoothed over the difficulties between generals and Commissioners in 1794 appear again in 1890, when François Sadi won the hearts of all Frenchmen in his progresses through the Departments. The courage with which Lazare withstood Napoleon and exposed the perfidy of Louis Philippe appears again in the late President's attacks on the methods of Grévy finance.

The French intellect—one might almost say the human intellect—has seldom been exhibited to greater advantage than in this line of capable citizens. Surely Nolay, which has already honoured in stone the memory of Lazare and of François, should erect a tablet to the memory of Claude and Margaret engraven with the thanks of the community for the illustrious progeny to which they gave birth.

JAMES CARLILL.

Art. 4.—MILTON AND VAUGHAN. ✓

A CERTAIN quiet obliquity of speech, in a writer, a disdain of italics, is a perfectly successful blind to those who read lightly. It is a famous complaint of Newman's (thus to wrong a great passage by putting it into common language) that, would one be taken by the populace to be in dead earnest, he must get up and screech, or else remain for ever half-understood, or less. A loose general understanding is the very most we care to give, or can give, our old poets. But some of them demand even more; they demand belief, and a clairvoyant intelligence which masters the context only by reading between the lines. This applies particularly to the generation just after Donne, which was moulded by him. These men spoke truth but shrank from explanation. Forthright speech came in during the Protectorate, when men of thought began to lose their excessive anxiety not to be understood by the vulgar. The true Carolians are cryptic; no one of them more so than Henry Vaughan. What intricate allusion, what shades of inflection, what an amazing play of comment flicker in and out of those shadowy pages, those seemingly calm pages of his! How hard he is to follow when attention relaxes ever so little! How critical, how external, how quite rabidly contemporaneous he proves, when a modern reader once gets into intimate touch with him! Would it were not so! The great unstated difference between him and Herbert whom he so constantly parodied (in the good old sense of the word) is that Herbert minds his prayers, and that the Silurist's eye is all over the room. An intense appeal was made to him by the stormy era in which he lived. Mystic as he is, he won his mysticism more through Plato and St Paul, and through moods engendered by deliberate sacrifice for principle's sake, than from any happiness of nature, or endowment of grace. Whenever his 'noble numbers' fail, as they do fail often, it is because the old political Adam in him is too strong for the harp of David. His critics have not said it; but Vaughan himself tells us many a time that this is so. He speaks, out of his very striking self-knowledge, of his 'fierce soul,' his 'fierce wild blood.' In a spirited early poem he thanks the 'blessed Powers' for his loss

of money and place; the 'strange means, almost miraculous,' which have been used to make and keep him poor, philosophical, and apart, and thereby effectually prevented from any 'meddling with the King or State.' If he had been 'rich,' he adds, that is just what he would have been doing, 'as sure as fate!' Years after, when Vaughan was converted to religion, and fixed in the intellectual way which he was to follow to the end of his long life, he gave backward or rather sidelong glances upon that world of men of which he, the poet of eternity, was so aware. Had he not good moral reasons for avoiding it, he says, 'none could with more advantage use' its 'loved wisdom'; and as for the flesh and the devil, he would 'dote' on them, too,

'Did not a greater Beauty rule mine eyes.'

Ejiciebas eas, intrabas pro eis: exactly as St Augustine says, in a sweet and powerful passage of the 'Confessions.'

All through Vaughan's work, in a hundred places, lies this record not only of his spiritual history in relation to his times, but of the times themselves. He took the side which nearly all the poets took in the great struggle. He was yet to break his heart over the troubles of the King and of the Church of England, as much as over that victorious popularism which sharply pinched himself, among the rest of the Malignants, in material as well as emotional ways. Unlike his twin brother, a Royalist first and last, but not in the midtime, Henry Vaughan never wavered in his allegiance. Nor did he ever waver in his passionate and unreconciled contempt for 'the dregs of an age' in which he presently found himself. Not only his secular mood, but his holiest raptures are continually deflected by the transient intrusion of questions of the day. The monopolies, Strafford's execution, the Decimation Tax, the readmission of the Jews, the casting of coin at Pontefract Castle whilst it was under siege, the introduction of the Directory, the working of the Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales—what not?—do we stumble upon, among what Mr Hutchinson in the 'Cambridge History of Literature' aptly calls 'the timeless mysterious poems' of Henry Vaughan. The poet held strong views

and knew his ground, as a Laudian High Churchman and a cavalry trooper out for the King.* Moreover, when closely studied, his pages betray a most scholarly sensitiveness towards the literary world of his day. It does not seem exaggeration to say that we get some unexpected yet natural glimpses of living faces, indicated but not named. Vaughan may well have been conscious of John Milton in every fibre of his being. Have we any evidence that this was the case?

English poetry then current, unlike English controversy, has next to nothing to say of its arch-priest. But Vaughan had been from the first considerably pre-occupied with his greatest contemporary. Milton's earliest collective book of verse was published in 1645 by Humphrey Moseley, who, a very little later, brought out Vaughan's slender firstfruits. The influence of the elder writer upon the younger has not been traced by editors, yet it is not to be doubted. It shows too plainly in the latter's 'Shepherds,' in the Priory Grove and River Isca poems. In the last-named, the Swan of Usk, writing of the Severn, allots to it 'Castara's smiles mix'd with fair Sabrin's tears,' thus complimenting Milton in company with Habington, Vaughan's own early literary model. Perhaps it is one of Milton's first printed compliments, if not the very first. There are charming reminiscences of Milton in the opening and in the ending of 'Daphnis,' and in other verses in Vaughan's youthful manner. However, with one or two fleeting exceptions, this lovely and creditable echo died out of the Silurist's work almost as soon as it came in, and possibly not automatically, but on account of the development of conscious antipathies. Milton at thirty-six, when Moseley championed his marvellous lyric genius, was hardly known as a poet, certainly not so known to the general London public. But, says Masson, he had been for four years, thanks to his prose pamphlets against oligarchy and prelacy, 'altogether one of the most marked of extreme Parliamentarians out of Parliament.' Violent attacks upon 'the villainous leading Incendiarie' (it is Anthony Wood

* An unpublished document proves this debated point in the affirmative.

who pleasingly calls him so) had been begun by Palmer, Baillie and Edwards, and lasted unabated up to 1648-9, by no means ceasing then, but somewhat smothered in the general din. 'Barbarous noises,' Milton himself tells us, in his grand overbearing way, assailed him, 'Of Owles and Cuckoos, Asses, Apes and Dogges!' And we are assured, from many authentic sources, that the Restoration, a dozen years later as J. R. Green remarks, 'found Milton of all living men the most hateful to the Royalists.'

To clear the way, one must dispose of an imputed reference to Milton in Vaughan's pages, which, it is to be feared, has no leg to stand on. Dr Grosart and other editors have played a little with that part of Vaughan's 'Daphnis' which alludes to 'the visions of our black but brightest Bard.' They have thought the phrase might apply to 'black,' i.e. blind, Homer, or, as even more likely, to 'black' Milton. Vaughan may well be picturing in the elegy his own Welsh-speaking boyhood on the banks of the Usk; but surely 'old Amphion,' with all his lore and foresight, could hardly have quoted those

'Dark records, and numbers nobly high'

of the 'Paradise Lost,' a score of years before Milton had so much as begun that epic? And Homer, whatever else he is, is not a predictive poet. These guesses at Homer and at Milton go too far afield. The 'black but brightest Bard' is, in all likelihood, the problematical Myrddin Emrys, otherwise Merlin surnamed Ambrosius, the chief diviner of ancient Wales.* His very name connotes 'black' in the old sense of 'sad, gloomy'; and our 'merle' is the blackbird yet. Geoffrey of Monmouth, in the 12th century, first translated into Latin the so-called Prophecies regarding the Norman Kings ('*Historiæ Regum Britanniae*,' lib. vii), and says of them: 'In all his prophecies I find nothing dissonant, incongruous, or absurd, nor anything foreign, nor averse from truth. And those who shall live in ages to come, shall find those his predictions as constantly

* 'In Welsh tradition famous as both bard and magician; but the poetical compositions which bear his name may safely be taken as spurious' (Prof. W. Lewis Jones, 'King Arthur,' p. 112).

to happen in their days (according to the limit of time), as we have hitherto found them certain and infallible even to the age in which we now live.' Very similar testimony, ages afterwards, is borne by Thomas Heywood, who puts forth a book 'never publish'd in this kinde before, and deserves to be knowne and observ'd by all men—' to wit, 'The Life of Merlin, surnamed Ambrosius, His Prophecies and Predictions Interpreted, and their Truth made Good by our English Annals . . . from Brute to the Reigne of our Royall Sovereigne King Charles.' Vaughan's whole passage is in complete harmony with these two citations:

'Here, when the carelesse world did sleep, have I,
In dark records, and numbers nobly high,
The visions of our black but brightest Bard
From old Amphions mouth full often heard,
With all those plagues poor shepheards since have knowne,
And riddles more, which future times must owne,
While on his pipe young Hylas played, and made
Musick as solemn as the song and shade.'

Robert Burton, he of 'The Anatomy of Melancholy,' wrote in Vaughan's time a 'History of the Principality of Wales,' in which he notes how the people 'do much glory in their Ambrosius Merlin.' James Howell bears the same testimony in a poem of 1663, that the Prophecies at that moment, as always in old times, 'through the world of fame bear such extent.' Remote as Merlin then was, the 'Avallenau' and the 'Hoianau,' historical records first forgotten as facts, then revived as forecasts, were on every lip among the long-memored Kymry. It was not of Milton nor of Homer, both 'black and bright' in their heroic blindness, that Vaughan was thinking when he wrote those quite local home-keeping lines.

Macaulay says (and to quote Macaulay in this instance is tempting): 'The public conduct of Milton must be approved or condemned according as the resistance of the people to Charles the First shall appear to be justifiable or criminal. . . . Milton in general left to others the credit of expounding and defending the popular parts of his religious and political creed. He took his own stand upon those which the great body of his countrymen

reprobated as criminal or derided as paradoxical; he stood up for divorce and regicide.' Though the King's execution bred great pity and revulsion, almost within the year Milton's 'Tenure of Kings and Magistrates'* had started thundering forth in successive editions that subjects may rightfully put a monarch to death; his 'Eikonoklastes' blew a prompt counterblast to the 'Eikon Basilike,' then 'exciting the conscience of England,' as Lamartine says, 'even to delirium'; and the loud attack on Salmasius and his doctrines ran at the heels of the Dutch scholar's defence of English royalty. Prof. Masson says there are very few manuscript pieces in Milton's own handwriting which are later in date than 1642. The very latest of all is an isolated sonnet in the notebook at Cambridge, dated 1648. This year may be taken to mark the utmost limit of Milton's free use of his eyesight, even then most grievously impaired. The left eye failed finally in 1650, during the composing of the answer to Salmasius; and (as all the world knows) by April 1652 Milton had gone totally blind. Blindness was certainly impending in 1646.

Now in the multiple little poem called 'The King Disguised,' which provokes an amazing amount of annotation of all kinds, the Silurist prays for his sovereign, on his secret journey to Newark, in the late April and early May of 1646:

'Ride safely in His shade Who gives thee light,
And can with blindness thy pursuers smite!'

The decasyllabics look harmless and conventional. In dozens of legends do 'pursuers' go blind; it is almost a medieval hagiological commonplace. But Henry Vaughan could hardly not have known of a fact familiar to most Englishmen of his profession and station. He was no stranger to London and the gossip of what then was a small city. Furthermore, it would be no wonder if he were capable of being cruel, with the cruelty of the time. Breaches of humanity and of taste were everyday occurrences throughout the still medieval 17th century. As one of a score of kindred instances,

* Thomason's date, written across the title-page of the Br. Mus. copy, is Feb. 13, 1648, i.e. 1649 by modern reckoning.

let us hear that entirely gentle creature Dr Robert South, delivering his mind (from the pulpit, too!) on the subject of the regicides, just after the Restoration. 'Their Latin advocate, Mr Milton,' he says, 'like a Blind Adder has spit so much Poyson on the King's Person and Cause' (South: 'Posthumous Works,' 1717: Sermon on the xxx January). Quite a match for this are the amenities of Mrs Sadleir, Sir Edward Coke's plain-spoken daughter, writing of 'Melton' to Roger Williams the colonist: 'God hath begun His punishment upon him here, who strook him with Blindness.' Who does not remember Milton's own feats in the department of unfair invective against Salmasius and lesser fry, and the delighted jeers of the time not only at my Lord Protector's 'copper' nose, and Davenant's destroyed one, but at Lauderdale's stammer, at Suckling's military failure, at Prince Rupert's grief for his dog Boy, killed at Marston Moor, and at poor Denham's temporary madness? Worst of all, the jibe even at the dying of little children, in the anti-Jacobite epigram which begins: 'Cambridge is dead, and Kendal riding post'?

God can smite with blindness King Charles' pursuers, says Vaughan. He has a known deadly emphasis; does he mean no more but that the Almighty can punish by loss of sight, if He so chooses, them who hunt down His elect? Or have we here some thrust of a bitterly personal kind? This much is sure: the Secretary to the new Council of State was the busiest 'pursuer' in all England of Charles I, his memory and his cause. And he was the only 'pursuer' who actually went blind.* But let us come away from marshiest conjecture to somewhat firmer ground.

In the beginning of his Preface to 'Silex Scintillans,' 1655, Vaughan complains of the low moral state into which the practice of letters had fallen in England, and deals a strong blow for its integrity as against 'willingly studied and wilfully published vanities,' which defile the minds of readers.

'Divers persons of eminent pietie and learning (I meddle not with the seditious and schismatical) have, long before my

* Lilly the astrologer did so, but hardly comes into the reckoning; moreover, his misfortune happened after 1677.

time, taken notice of this malady; for the complaynt against vitious verse, even by peaceful and obedient spirits, is of some antiquity in this kingdom.'

So it was—witness Sidney, Spenser, Francis Meres, Drayton, Daniel, Habington, and others; but our concern here is solely with the writer's parenthesis. He 'meddles not with,' that is, he will take no account of, any passage to his purpose which has been penned by the 'seditious and schismaticall,' to promote the cause of decency, 'long before [his] time.' Thus he dismisses Prynne, and Milton too. We may recall at once that when Vaughan says 'long,' he does not give good measure. This is evident from a similar use of the word in his 'Olor' Preface, dated 1647, which might be taken to mean the lapse of a decade at the very least, did we not know for certain that its utmost limit there would be five years. So here, 'long before my time,' a clause which covers the whole history of the debate, also covers 1641, the year in which was published the famous pamphlet, 'Church Government.' In that pamphlet, following the beautiful account of his own early and yet-deferred dreams of serving the ideals of literature, Milton goes on to deplore its wretched state at the moment. It is to him, says Prof. Masson, summing up, 'a matter of serious national concern. It might even be well if the Magistracy and Government were to take these matters to some extent within their charge, managing the public sports and pastimes, like the famous Governments of old. . . . His own contribution to the literature of England, at all events, should be one conceived and perfected according to this all but forgotten standard' ('Life of Milton,' 1871, vol. II, p. 386).

Milton is set upon some coercive remedy, more strongly than Vaughan himself.

'And what a benefit this would be to our youth and gentry, may be soon guessed by what we know of the corruption and bane which they sucke in dayly from the writings and interludes of libidinous and ignorant poetasters, who, having scarce ever heard of that which is the main consistence of a true poem, the choice of such persons as they ought to introduce, and what is morall and decent to each one, do for the most part lap up vitious principles in sweet pills, to be

swallow'd down, and make the taste of vertuous documents harsh and sour.' ('The Reason of Church Government urged against Prelaty.' By Mr John Milton. In two Books. London. . . . At the Sunne in Paules Churchyard, 1641, p. 39.)

Prynne's famous protest is stronger yet, though his arrows are shot at the contemporary drama.

No one can read Vaughan's profoundly serious Preface of 1655, and fail to see how completely the just-quoted citation from Milton plays into his hands. He will have none of it; he will not so much as allow that the case has already been authoritatively stated. Vaughan cannot but have known that the one living literary Englishman of note who was upholding conspicuously the banner of righteousness in art was just John Milton; but always, to the hot-hearted Welsh Royalist, Milton was invalidated *propter hoc*. Disillusion, prejudice, and the shadow of the White King stand between Vaughan and any endorsement of the great man of letters whom, as a literary model, he had venerated. He 'meddles' no more with lost souls of the 'seditious and schismaticall.' No: but he has his tongue in his cheek as he says it, for he is getting ready for an attack on the chief of them, farther along in this very Preface. It is a pity to see the same highwayman lurking behind every bush, as one crosses the heath; nevertheless, there was no other contemporary deserving of the heavy cannonade conveyed in Vaughan's large adjectives, none whose contradictions or corroborations would have been to him of the same weight.

He thus proceeds to shell Milton's—shall we not call it Milton's?—august citadel:

'But an idle or sensual subject is not all the poison in these pamphlets. Certaine authours have been so irreverently bold as to dash Scriptures, and the sacred Relatives of God, with their impious conceits; and (which I cannot speak without grief of heart) some of these desperate adventurers may, I think, be reckoned amongst the principal or most learned writers of English verse.'

And he goes on, secondly, to censure the dissemination of lewd anthologies, the 'Drolleries' of the day, in which no offenders in the length and breadth of England were more prominent than Milton's nephews, Edward and

John Philips. Now the 'desperate Adventurers' here, like the 'pursuers' of the earlier script, like all the subjects of Vaughan's individual antagonism, whom he deigns to mention, are in the plural. Nothing could be more characteristic. He knew very well, as we know, that there was but one 'principall or most learned' writer living in England in 1654, who could be accused of founding his own novel views upon Bible texts. Prof. Masson has some pertinent pages on Milton's fearless heterodoxy and his methods of twisting Scripture to his purpose ('Life,' ed. 1880, vol. vi, pp. 817-822). He had built upon quotations from the Old Testament his thesis that Kings and other rulers hold their power from the people, and are to be controlled by the people. He went much further. 'Not only did the Puritan Milton declare that the entire Decalogue was abrogated by a law of love, not only did he come forward as a pronounced anti-Sabbatarian, not only did he degrade marriage to a civil contract, advocate divorce for other causes than adultery, and justify polygamy as lawful for Christians, but he deliberately rejected the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. . . . With a patient and serene audacity, Milton compiles his theology from the words of Scripture' (Dowden: 'Puritan and Anglican,' 1901, pp. 183, 184). Misuse of this sort is a great grief to Vaughan, with his natural conservatism, and in the flood-tide of his own awakened religious genius.

He reverts in 'Silex,' II., and twice again in 'Thalia Rediviva,'* to the then recent translation of the many-tomed Dutch Bible, and to contemporary editions, those full of 'egregious blasphemies and damnable erratas,' published by Cromwell's printers, Field and Hills, beginning in the March of 1655. Vaughan's exact purpose and obvious hit have gone unheeded. The poet pledges himself, out of godly but probably mixed motives, to hold aloof from 'bold fables' and 'strange comments' foisted upon 'the Truth,' lamenting that 'the Truth' itself is 'poyson'd' by 'deprav'd tastes,' and

'The forgeries which impious wit
And power force on Holy Writ.'

* See 'The Day of Judgment,' Muses' Library Edition of Vaughan, i, 268; 'The World, and The Bee,' *idem.*, ii, 271, 274.

It is pretty clear that Theodore Haak (Milton's admirer and translator) supplies the impious Wit, and Oliver Protector the impious Power. In other words, the Parliament was lending its full authority to the Calvinistic interpretation of Scripture, considered salutary for the English public. The Dutch Annotations were published in 1637; Haak was officially chosen to translate them in 1648; and the last volume of his completed task came out in 1657. The Government's zeal for the Bible, or rather, for its own view of the Bible, was very marked during the Protectorate. A revised translation of the whole was projected by the Parliament of 1656, and a Committee was appointed; but after a few meetings, the matter gradually dropped (Whitlock's 'Memorials': Feb. 6, 1656-7). In making his own protest against the use of any but the Authorised Version, Vaughan would retrospectively have been aware that Oliver's 'Souldiers Pocket Bible' of 1643 had the Geneva text, which Laud banned, and made it a crime to sell or import. Vaughan's general ground of complaint need not detain us. There is something not general, one fears, but highly individual, following an apostrophe of his, in a stanza of 'The Agreement,' to the 'beamy Book,' 'the Mount,' 'the Oyle,' 'the Winehouse,' 'the healing Leaves.'

'Each page of thine hath true life in't,
And Gods bright mind express'd in print.'

He goes on to specialise and whittle down to his point, the rhymes falling at loggerheads with each other on the way.

'Most modern books are blots on Thee,
Their doctrine chaff and windy fits,
Darken'd along, as their scribes be,
With those foul storms when they were writ,
While the man's zeale lays out and blends
Only self-worship and self-ends.'

It may be well to note that in 1655 a book called 'modern' was not so-called in our present broad meaning, but only as indicating a current or very recent publication. The context of 'modern books' clearly points to some books of an ethical cast, popular enough to justify this public protest. What Vaughan says so angrily and

satirically about them mirrors his necessary opinion of Milton and his work; and how can one escape the inference that it is of the most conspicuous 'doctrine' known to him that he speaks? Notice 'Zeale,' one of several verbal arrows which Vaughan, following Jonson, reserves for his Puritan fellow-countrymen; he uses it invariably and solely for them. It was a word they had liked, and he catches it up everywhere (as Denham and others were doing), with an ironic inflection which is audible enough. Of 'self-worship' no psychologist will acquit the majestic mind of John Milton. As for 'self-ends,' it is a favourite idiom of the Silurist's, though not peculiar to him. It may here apply not only to the impression made upon Vaughan by Milton's career, but to some known single fact of it. After all, Milton's idealism was quite capable of 'self-ends:' witness certain weighty philippics on the charms of divorce secretly begun during the very honeymoon of poor little Mistress Mary Powell; and so on, and so forth. Then we have 'darken'd Scribes,' of course in the plural, again. Even the Scribes' 'doctrine' is 'darken'd' by the 'foul stormes' of polemics and public discord. A possible interpretation may well be that the 'Scribes' themselves are only mentally befogged. A habit of taking Vaughan's utterances at their full value will, however, point to a frank collating of the blind work with the blinded worker. One would prefer to carry away a doubt whether he is indeed covertly accusing and attacking once more the supreme contemporary poet, 'eyeless in Gaza.' But does it not look like real lion-baiting, kept up to the last? All these diatribes, being Vaughan's, must mean something; they cannot be passed over. Let their meanings be threshed out by some other student to whom Vaughan is also a subject of recurrent interest. He may not agree with me; and yet again, on second thought, he may.

LOUISE IMOGEN GUINEY.

Art. 5.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF EUCKEN. ✓

I.

1. *Prolegomena zur Forschungen über die Einheit des Geisteslebens in Bewusstsein und That der Menschheit.* Von Rudolf Eucken. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1885.
2. *Die Einheit des Geisteslebens in Bewusstsein und That der Menschheit.* Untersuchungen von Rudolf Eucken. 7^{te} Auflage. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1888.
3. *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion.* 3^{te} Auflage. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1912.
4. *Die Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker, eine Entwicklungsgeschichte des Lebensproblems der Menschheit vom Plato bis zur Gegenwart.* Von Rudolf Eucken. 7^{te} Auflage. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1907.
5. *Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt. Neue Grundlegung einer Weltanschauung.* Von Rudolf Eucken. 2^{te} neugestaltete Auflage. Leipzig: Veit, 1907.
6. *Geistige Strömungen der Gegenwart.* Von R. Eucken. 4^{te} umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig: Veit and Co., 1913.
7. *Der Sinn und Wert des Lebens.* Von Rudolf Eucken. 3^{te} umgearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Leipzig: Quelle and Meyer, 1913. Translated by Lucy Judge Gibson and W. R. Boyce Gibson. London: Black, 1909.
8. *The Religious Philosophy of Rudolf Eucken.* By Friedr. von Hügel. ('Hibbert Journal,' April 1912.)
9. *An Interpretation of Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy.* By W. Tudor Jones. London: Williams & Norgate, 1913. (The Appendix to this book gives a bibliography of Eucken's works, and of English translations from them.)

AMONG the leaders of the general movement towards substituting life for thought as the banner of philosophy, no one, unless it were M. Bergson, is to-day more prominent than Rudolf Eucken. In his own country his writings, though exceedingly voluminous, have run through many editions; and in the English-speaking world he has found distinguished interpreters, and his name is better known than that of any German thinker since Haeckel and Nietzsche. It is no common thing for such a reputation to be attained by a living Professor of Philosophy; and the 'New Idealism' which he preaches is a sign of the times.

Eucken shares with the general mind of to-day the doctrine that life is action and not mere intelligence. This does not mean, for him, the acceptance either of Pragmatism or of Voluntarism. Pragmatism—such is his verdict—marches under the flag of utility; and the useful is *ex hypothesi* the inferior. Voluntarism puts Will in the centre; and, by merely reading one mental function for another, leaves us as one-sided as before. Action is life, in Eucken's 'activism,' neither as seeking some special goal, nor as springing from some special source, but because in it, and in it alone, life reveals itself as a complete and satisfactory experience. 'On ne peut pas s'appuyer que sur ce qui résiste.' In the full typical activity, an actual and solid fact is at the same time the utterance and expression of the self; and it is only in so far as we approach such an activity that we genuinely possess in ourselves true life and living. Our experience is in this case a fact of the most substantive order—we may think of an artist's creation or a successful reformer's enterprise—and yet it is ours, and embodies ourself; and more than that, it is something which we have created; it is a new being. Our centre of gravity, so to speak, is shifted outside our mere average and trivial existence. We are buoyed up and inspired by contact with a new order of things.

In this attitude of 'activism' are implied two positions which are for Eucken fundamental. Life, he contends, is a problem; and its first serious step is a negation.

Life is a problem through and through, and especially so to the modern mind. What were facts for our fathers—say morality, or space and time—are problems for us. The mind digs deeper as the ages pass. The axioms of yesterday are the paradoxes of to-day. And the paradoxes demand solution; but not from the intelligence. For solutions come not by insight but by action. A problem is a given situation; in the situation we act, and in acting we transform at once ourselves and our world. So we make a new thing; we create a solution where to mere understanding there was none. And thus we originate our world; we do not simply accept it. True originality comes second and not first in time. Out of bare nature we create a spiritual order; out of

temporal history we make a spiritual present. We concentrate into an act, a quintessential extract of the historical succession, the meaning of our generation, of our epoch, of all time. The past, active in our minds and habits, becomes a present power. Out of the linear series of occurrences, which by itself amounts to nothing, we build up the order of ethical and religious life, which is in principle one with what is eternally real.

Thus, secondly, all life worth living begins with a negation. Eucken's favourite adjective is 'new'; and to master its implications is to grasp his philosophy. On a single page (229) of 'The Battle for a Spiritual Content in Life' (the mere title is suggestive) we find heaped together such phrases as 'the new world,' 'a new kind of life,' 'this new life,' 'a new creation,' 'a re-birth of life and being'; and this page is typical. Or we may turn to the book entitled 'The Truth of Religion' (p. 129) and read, 'Religion can subsist without belief in a God; the old genuine Buddhism proves that; but without a duality of worlds, without an outlook into a new being, it becomes an empty phrase.'

Hardly less frequent is the correlated substantive 'breach.' Nothing, Eucken continually reiterates, is so essential as a 'breach' with the normal, with the average, with current social life, with the merely human, with human pettiness, with mere nature. For the question of questions, the ultimate 'Either . . . or,' is simply this; whether our life is a mere annexe or sequel of physical nature, or is rooted in an independent self-existent spiritual order. Into such an order, if life is to be worth living, we must be reborn. The language is that of religious conversion. By an act in which our own freedom joins with the divine grace, and which can never be replaced by a gradual growth, we must achieve and attain the spiritual world, which is in kind eternal, but, as the creature of our freedom, is a new thing. The spiritual life is a fact and reality in itself. It is not merely 'subjective'; it is sharply contrasted with the life of the natural man, the mere individual, and his trivial associative consciousness. It is the life of conscious moral endeavour, sustained by a sense of unity with something greater than ourself—in a word, by religion.

And thus what he speaks of as Intellectualism can

solve no ultimate problem. For it thinks it can explain what we find given—'the first existence,' as Eucken calls it. And, thinking it can explain, it is willing to accept; and therefore readily submits to the 'given' and respects the character of 'given-ness'—that is, of what we find the world *prima facie* to be like. 'Intellectualism' will never take the attitude that actual existence—the world as it presents itself—may be simply intolerable and a thing that must be ended. It can never found itself upon the great disjunction, the 'Either . . . or,' which demands an uncompromising choice between nature and spirit.

Now, this is what the New Idealism emphatically does. It is decidedly, if not even violently, progressist, ethical, humanist or anthropocentric. Not indeed progressist in the sense of deducing, whether with the speculative philosopher or with the scientific naturalist, an inevitable evolution from the thought or law of the universe. That it condemns as a quietist or fatalist attitude, relieving the individual from the task which it throws upon nature or an absolute being. But the New Idealism is progressist in the double sense that it holds vast changes in our existing world and society to be demanded by the very conception of spiritual life, and that it treats the *de facto* succession of events as a series of real possibilities—of points where it is open to personal activity to transmute the passing occurrence into a feature in a spiritual world. It would say with Goethe :

'Säume nicht, dich zu erdreisten
Wenn die Menge zaudernd schweift;
Alles kann der Edle leisten
Der versteht und rasch ergreift.'

Again, it is ethical. The distinctively ethical temper, the temper of the 'ought,' which feels constantly a flat antagonism between what is and what ought to be, colours the New Idealism through and through. The social average of conduct and culture, the merely human, the pettiness of mankind, are habitually treated with the contempt which marks the reforming moralist in every age. This is pointedly shown by Eucken's attitude to history. For the average of mankind it is a fetter, and you might almost say they would be better without it. Only for the gifted few is it a creative inspiration.

And the New Idealism is humanistic, in the most emphatic sense. Nature as such, nature below man, it would seem, has no rights and no share in the spiritual life. In man there is a great new departure. Just a single line of natural evolution runs up through him, and breaks out into the world of spirit and eternity. All others are blind alleys. M. Bergson has a somewhat kindred thought.

But for man, as a creature capable of the spiritual life, the New Idealism is a doctrine of Personalism. Individualism, indeed, it roundly repudiates. Individuals are considered as conscious being in a 'punctual' form; that is to say, when its existence is in separate points, sporadic, particularist, atomistic. That is the note of 'nature,' of current or average society, in which, Eucken is convinced, the self-preservation of the unit is inevitably the patent or latent end. To the Individual so understood the Person is the opposite extreme. The Individual is natural, the Person is spiritual. A Person is one who acts, in the full sense of the word, and acts purposively, instead of being a mere transition point in a process. He has enacted the 'breach'—one thinks of Francis of Assisi—and has chosen the negation. He has entered upon the new life, and has created for himself a place in the spiritual order—a world in which he is a world, a system in which he is, not a point, but also a system.

His life, the life worth living, is *pro tanto* of the heroic type. The word 'heroism' has a technical import for the New Idealism. It means the conscious acceptance of the breach and battle with what in a familiar sense has been called 'the world'—what Eucken constantly speaks of as the average social level, and in the other similar terms which were cited above.

Thus the fundamental point is in his eyes the independent or self-dependent and self-existent spiritual life, as something over against and opposed to natural and given existence. On the Aye or No to its actual reality hangs the whole question whether life is or is not worth living. 'The eternal order,' he tells us, 'exists as a new kind of reality.'* Extraordinary paradox,

* 'Geistige Strömungen der Gegenwart,' p. 264.

which sums up Eucken's philosophy! Here again we notice the word 'new,' which, while emphasising the fundamental contrast of nature and spirit, seems further to throw it into the shape of a temporal succession. It represents, as we have seen, a change within our life in time, though it also indicates the point at which that life lays hold of eternity. It is to be illustrated, as we saw, and as Eucken points out, by such doctrines as that of the new birth, or the new man, what Hegel called the Brahmin or the twice-born. It indicates that all life worth living is something to be made and achieved, not simply to be accepted or understood. Such life is created in some degree by every real act, by every act in which the law of the object is made one with the law of the self.

And here the New Idealism demands a profound control of actual things—a real and visible progress. The breach and battle are to herald a victory; and things as they are must be *de facto* spiritualised. It is not incidental but essential to this ethical Idealism to hope with strong assurance for a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

The root of value, then, is in the self-existent spiritual world. Between Aye and No there is here no middle course. Either such a world is real and actual, a solid fact of experience which cannot be reasoned away, or men's life is as cheap as beasts'. It is a 'new' fact, but belongs to an eternal order. Thought, indeed, cannot establish it. Action, and action alone, can establish it; and can establish it only by bringing it to pass. It is brought to pass within 'the world of work,' as the higher spirit and endeavour of civilisation. We say emphatically *within*, but not *as* the world of work. For much of the *de facto* world of human achievement has broken loose from personality, from the expression of spiritual life, or has remained below its level, and only exists as a monstrous mechanical routine.

Eucken's more technical discussions centre round the 'personal world,' the 'self-existent spiritual life,' which he contrasts as 'essence' and 'essential' with the immediate facts of 'first' or given existence. The centre of gravity of his metaphysic does not lie in the removal of contradictions from our notions of the universe, but in

the affirmation of *eternal* values as *created*—he would accept the paradox—in the personal life; not discovered by cognition, but created by decisiveness of will and persistent activity. When life acquires an inward depth corresponding to its outward extension, and the world without enters into a world within, as it ceases to be 'punctual' or individual, and becomes systematic or personal, then it becomes an essence of which we partake rather than a mere property of our subjective selves; and 'through the variety of occurrences there results the formation of a persistent ground, the formation of an essence not beyond but within the activity. Then life has achieved self-existence,'* 'essence-formation,' and becomes one of the equivalents for entrance upon the world of personality, the new life, the self-existent life of spirit, the full or genuine activity.

The philosophical support of these views is furnished in the main by an analytic comparison of what Eucken calls 'life-systems' or 'syntagmas,' in intentional opposition to doctrinal or logical ideas. They are conceived as forces and organisations by which men have lived and live, belonging to phases of culture and civilisation in each of which the mind has embodied a certain character and expression of itself. It is in the strength of these actual powers that the opposing theories do battle; and it is not controversial superiority but the whole movement of life and history that determines their respective failure or survival.

Eucken's specification of such orders or organisations of life varies remarkably in different works. But it is easy to trace the central line of his thought. It is expressed in the reiterated sequence of such watchwords as Form, Process (or Evolution of Force), Essential Action; or Work of Art, Process, Living Activity. What these successions indicate is that three main 'Life Systems,' two of which fall under the head of Process, are or have been predominant, previously to that which he preaches as the system of the future.

The system embodied in the life and thought of Greece at its best was modelled on the fact or type of Art. It treated the universe as a static and plastic

* 'Sinn und Wert des Lebens,' p. 64.

whole in which matter was subordinated to form; evil was the æsthetic foil of good; infinity was inconceivable; movement was cyclical; and progress, freedom, personality, were unrecognised.

The second term of the succession, Process, covers two great modern life-systems with which we still have to reckon, and which have in common the recognition of an evolution of force or power as the principle of things. In their confidence of this world-process both alike are unregardful of freedom and personality, and accept with easy-going indifference the evil that is in the world. One of these two systems, Naturalism, expresses the triumphant attitude of natural science; the other, Intellectualism, is rooted in the mere function of thought, when conceived as though *per se* it were the sole generator of the universe.

In contrast with these three orders, the life-system of the future, the Personal system, the order of self-existent spiritual life, embodied in the New Idealism, is characterised in the sketch which has been given of Eucken's views. It is supported in argument by its contrast with the defects of the others, and in actual influence by the inevitable attitude which springs *de facto* from the culture and civilisation of to-day. It should be noted that Eucken regards himself as a modern of the moderns, and so far agrees with the two great 'process' Systems that he definitely breaks with the plastic ideas of Greece and the medieval conception of a hierarchy of the universe, and founds himself on the experience of progress and evolution.

In affirming Personality, however, he is led to insist strongly on the 'inwardness' of our world; and this in a pregnant sense. It is not merely that consciousness is different from extension, which would be admitted even by associative Psychology, which is for him akin to Naturalism and hostile to true philosophy. It is that the whole structure of human achievement, from science itself upwards, indicates the operation of an original spring of life far transcending physical nature. Against psychological method, as he understands it in terms of associationism, he sets a method of his own which he calls 'Noological,' depending on the recognition of mental process in which the subject develops itself through

purposive interaction with its object. His theory of knowledge, emphasising the creativeness of mind, insists somewhat strongly on mentalism, though it sharply disowns subjectivism. All this he presses into the service of the argument that our world is our own, the original creation of the spirit which is more than individuals; and can neither be external as for Naturalism, nor a mere set of thought-transitions as for Intellectualism.

Problems of ultimate reality, then, are for him subordinate to the affirmation of the universal spiritual life, and are to be determined in accordance with this, which he considers an obvious actual fact, made present by and in human achievement. Still, a philosopher must deal with them, and we turn to consider his attitude to the most central of them.

A question of first principles, which goes to the heart of his position, may be expressed in three kindred forms; whether time and progress belong to ultimate reality; whether evil in the universe is or ever can be overcome; whether morality, in its strict and natural sense, can be in principle one with religion.

As an activist he accepts *prima facie* the reality of time and change, because, apart from this, creative progress and amendment must be illusory. Thus Eucken's central criticism of all faith in an Absolute is that it constitutes an *ignava ratio*. If the universe is eternally perfect we have only to acquiesce. Then progress and activity are illusions. If, on the other hand, activity has a real function, it follows that there is something to be done, and the universe as a whole is capable of progress. On the other hand, as we saw, he has much to say of an eternal order, an order which is originated by creative will, but which, in being originated, is also communicated to the mere individual and received by him. We may believe with his distinguished interpreter, Prof. Boyce Gibson, that in Eucken's view the two things are consistent. We may hold that eternity lies in the ever renewed conquest of time, of which in some degree we are continually aware. Here once more we are referred to the primacy of the actual spiritual life. But as a matter of first principles the relation of the eternal order to the progressive world remains contradictory so long as both are simply set side by side.

The question whether evil is or can be overcome repeats the problem in a more poignant form. Constantly Eucken leaves the impression that here reasoning is idle, and there is no argument but the sword. When you combat evil, and then alone, in the strength of the self-existent life, you become aware that it can be combated. But in the visible world 'the ideal forces are beyond any doubt the weaker.' Here is a remarkable passage:

'The idea becomes irresistible, that for reasons beyond our ken, in some certain sphere of the spiritual world—for unquestionably the problem reaches higher than humanity—a split, a severance of operation from essence, has taken place, and that for our eye this conflict reaches its climax in human existence' ('*Einheit des Geisteslebens*,' p. 445). 'Explanation' (he adds) 'becomes at this point mere romance; there is no road open between a feeble rationalist optimism and a dualistic Manichæism, and yet we are not to abandon the ultimate foundation in reason of all occurrences' (ib. p. 443).

We are driven to infer that his view belongs in principle to those which confront existing evil with a faith in future good. For him, indeed, this faith comes not with observation, but arises solely from the force that reveals itself when we set our hands to the fray. Yet it is quite clear that, however little he may hold our world to be finally determined, he never for a moment believes that the issue of the combat is uncertain. If not within our world itself, yet 'in some further connections of which it is a member, there is assuredly a superior reason.*' But, if so, the battle against evil is after all an illusion, for Eucken no less than for the speculative philosophy he censures. If it is not a fair fight, with an uncertain issue, his criticism returns upon his own doctrine. And speculative philosophy is at least able to indicate a ground for a continuous conflict, in the nature of things, connected with the very root and source of values. For Eucken it is left wholly gratuitous, and the contradiction is therefore intensified.

It is the same problem, applied to personal life, when we ask how the moral attitude can be reconciled with

* '*Sinn und Wert des Lebens*,' p. 146.

that of religion. And the ambiguity recurs. If in the universe the highest aim is already attained, then there is no room and no use for ethical activity.* Thus, not merely the detail of morality—about that there is no dispute—but its distinctive attitude of facing an unaccomplished task, infects the essence of religion. Attainment is thrown into the future, purely owing to the fear that the moral attitude must be destroyed if religion implies a belief in a perfection eternally real. And yet Eucken justly appreciates the intensity of moral freedom and initiative in those whom we might call the great religious determinists—he cites St Paul, Augustine, Luther. In all religious experience the fact stares us in the face that the more absolute the faith in eternally realised perfection, the more burning and irresistible is the moral will to be at one with it. The alleged risk of Quietism is a piece of Intellectualist reflection, which runs away alike from the religious fact and from the metaphysical problem. How refreshing in opposition to this ethical rhetoric is such a passage as the following:

‘Nothing is easier than for a one-sided reflection to rush in with a cry for clearness and consistency, and to apply its favourite “Either . . . or.” If real, how realise? If realise, then not real. . . . We see that the religious consciousness refuses the dilemma. It holds to both one and the other, and to one because of the other, and pronounces such reflections irrelevant.’ (Bradley, ‘Ethical Studies,’ p. 287.)

We noted above the recognition that belief in a God is not necessary for religion; but we do not find the serious enquiry, which such an observation should introduce, in what, if so, religion fundamentally consists. Nor does there seem to be any clear decision how much of permanent reality belongs to the ‘world of persons’ nor any account of its relation to the divine being, whether by way of membership, or of external dependence. There is more than a hint of the doctrine, attractive to many minds, that personal survival is for some but not for all. Sometimes, Eucken observes, the soul seems to be dead before the body, and survival becomes hardly conceivable.

* ‘Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion,’ p. 153.

Eucken's wide influence appears to rest partly on a very considerable merit, and partly on a piece of good fortune. It is his merit to have made himself the prophet of a simple and central truth, which has been the burden of the greatest philosophy of all ages. This is the truth of the primacy and solid reality of the substantive spiritual life by which man rises into membership of an eternal world. And it was a piece of historical good fortune that, striking in at a moment of anti-speculative reaction in his own country, he was enabled to be one of a few in preaching this truth, and yet to preach it as a modern to moderns, liberated by the critical temper of the day from a great deal of lumber (as, for instance, the philosophy of nature) which makes much in the classical German philosophy obsolete and unendurable.

But when he has tried, under the influence, it may be suspected, of Trendelenburg—'Trendelenburg means low water mark in German philosophy' (Hartmann cited by Wallace)—to fix the stigma of Intellectualism on his great forerunners, and to adopt for himself a technically activist position, he has been overtaken, it may be suggested, by an inevitable Nemesis.

For anyone who is deeply in sympathy with speculative philosophy, or with the anthropological research or social strivings of to-day, must receive a serious shock from the general tone of Eucken's moralisings. He will be aware of a certain hostility alternating with neglect towards the realm of Nature below man, towards the beginnings of morals and religion in early society, towards the detail of normal character and conduct, towards the ethical import of institutions, and towards the greatness of Hellenism and the Middle Age. That a man should write literally thousands of pages about the spiritualisation of individual life, and yet refer in only three or four passages, and that quite in passing, to the crucial example of the family, which entirely destroys the conception of a primitive individualism, this can only be accounted for by some remarkable theoretical bias. Those whose philosophical faith is in great measure sustained by the greatness which they find in human nature precisely where to the untrained eye life is meanest and most squalid, or who have been accustomed

to recognise 'My Station and its Duties' as the primary and central solution of the ethical problem, must feel as if in the deluge of ethico-religious rhetoric the plain foundations of ethics were being washed away.

It is a general impression of this kind which has suggested to Eucken's very able interpreter to defend him against the imputation of being revolutionary. But the point lies deeper than that. It is that Eucken really and truly exhibits what Hegel just as certainly does not, and that is, the central vice of Intellectualism.

The case is quite clear. The vice of Intellectualism lies in being satisfied with theory when what is needed is practice. Against this danger there is one and only one safeguard, and that is, to recognise cognitive thought in its true place, as one among the forms of practice, having a function and satisfaction of its own. Then it runs on its own rails, attends to its own work, and can never usurp the place of practice in any other region. It ranges unobstructed over the kindred activities of life and living, and freely appreciates their continuity and concrete structure as they stand or grow, plucking out the heart of their mystery.

But supposing that you suffer from an alarm that free cognition must mean construction out of empty thinking—and the German reaction did so suffer—then you are tempted to deny cognition its distinctive rank and function, and to insert it as a by-product into the growths and energies of actual practical life. This is what Eucken has done; his Syntagmas are obviously theories and not life-systems—theories of his own based on the theories of others, two or three removes from vital fact. And the result is, of course, as if one had built a house with dynamite for mortar. Cognitive thought, crushed within the pretended life-systems, has exploded them into a dust of ideas, by which no man ever actually lived; and the concrete continuity which free cognition would have traced and appreciated, falling outside the selected systems or below their level of abstraction, is never brought to light at all. There are real life-systems, from which the secret of life may be elicited by untrammelled cognition. But they are such facts as the gregarious animal, the tribe and the tribal self, the family, society, and the state, with their uniting mind and will,

and their inherent ethics and religion. Of all this we hear from Eucken hardly a word; and he has little serious study of art or religion as such. It is the self-conscious reforming moralist, shut up in his narrow 'progressive' system, and not the living citizen or artist or man of religion, who dominates the theory. It is due to the same characteristic that there is in Eucken's immense literary output, since the days of his early Aristotelian writings, no really precise and serious contribution to philosophical science. Free cognition has here been submerged by moralistic rhetoric, though, in controversy against Pragmatism, Eucken shows himself aware of its value.

The Intellectualism which results from displacing free cognition is plainly to be seen in that treatment of religious conviction which was discussed above. Why, Eucken asks of the speculative philosopher, should we wait to practise religion till we have proved the existence of God? But as against the speculative philosopher the question is pointless. For he considers it his business to understand the religious consciousness in the interests of philosophy, but not to dictate to or reform it. To the activist, on the other hand, it is fatal. For he, as we saw, not being thorough either in his facts or in his metaphysic, sacrifices the actual religious consciousness to a metaphysical perplexity, which, just because the facts are sacrificed, remains insoluble.

There is a saying of Mr F. H. Bradley which suggests the true estimate of all these philosophies which commit the intellectualist error of looking for theory in the wrong place because they have denied it in the right one. 'To love unsatisfied the world is a mystery, a mystery which love satisfied seems to comprehend. The latter is wrong only because it cannot be content without thinking itself right' (Preface to 'Appearance and Reality').

And this must be our verdict on Eucken's activism. Like love, a full activity is a fine thing, but it is not a theory of itself. And if we look for its essence in its own reflective ideas, we misconceive the energy, and what we gain is not philosophy. Therefore his doctrine, in spite of its great central merit, and the nobility of its aim, leaves many of us cold. What we want is a more

free, pure and continuous cognition, and because of that, and by its means, life-systems more concrete and actual, revealed by a completer analysis and a broader sympathy.

BERNARD BOSANQUET.

II.

PROF. EUCKEN's philosophy has had a wide vogue. It has been translated into many languages. It has found favour not only in the West but in the East. The English versions have not followed each other faster than have the translations into Japanese. Its religious inspiration, its humane quality, its breadth, its unquenchable vitality have brought to many not only insight but vision, not only a philosophy but enlargement of life.

Meanwhile there has been no dearth of criticism; and it may readily be admitted that vitality, like other great gifts, brings its Nemesis with it. Like the proverbial good teacher, it is apt to repeat itself, and its activistic partialities do not favour conceptual precision. Moreover, the thought which aspires to represent a philosophy of life and reality as a whole must needs forfeit many fruitful points of contact with physics, biology and especially psychology. Criticisms such as these have already found voice in many quarters, but it has been very largely felt that these deficiencies did not touch the heart of the philosophy, that the 'movement' has many compensating advantages over the 'concept,' and that a thinker who could grasp the totality of things so powerfully and so profoundly as does Prof. Eucken might readily be forgiven some lack of conceptual precision.

But a more searching criticism is now making its way to the front. Prof. Eucken, it is admitted, has a message for the age, but is the message a philosophy? We are presented with a philosophy of life; but what we receive, is it not a life rather than a philosophy? an inspiration, a religion if you will, rather than a theoretical system? When Mr Widgery, in the valuable Introductory Note to his translation of one of Eucken's works,* writes as follows: 'It has been remarked, and the present writer

* 'Life's Basis and Life's Ideal,' p. vii.

would be among the first to acknowledge the truth of the statement, that the voice is that of a prophet in the sense of an ethical teacher, rather than that of a philosopher in the more technical sense,' he implicitly raises the further question whether a philosophy so qualified is really a philosophy at all. Prof. Perry, in his 'Present Philosophical Tendencies' (p. 154), raises the question explicitly and comes very near to a negative conclusion. After classing Eucken's activism as a romanticism,* and alluding to its 'mood of riotous spirituality,' he adds :

'it becomes in the end a question of the function of philosophy. If philosophy be an attempt to inspire men with noble and elevating sentiments, the romanticists are perpetually right. But, if philosophy be the attempt to think clearly and cogently about the world, and lay bare its actualities and necessities—for better or for worse—then romanticism is irrelevant. It is not a false philosophy; it is simply not, in the strict theoretical sense, a philosophy at all.'

The reservations which the terms 'in the more technical sense,' and 'in the strict theoretical sense' respectively convey suggest that there is a sense other than 'technical' and 'strictly theoretical' in which Prof. Eucken's presentation of truth may legitimately rank as a philosophy. It will be the main business of the present article to seek that sense and fix it.

The distinctive feature of Eucken's philosophy is the subordination of the concept to the life-process. The conviction that philosophy is homeless till it has found the main life-currents of humanity, has sympathetically insinuated itself into these, and allowed all its convictions to be moulded inwardly and objectively by the movements with which it has allied itself, is, we may venture to say, the ruling inspiration of Eucken's whole philosophical method. We find it definitely stated in the preface to

* This identification of activism with romanticism is surely misleading. Eucken himself deliberately distinguishes his own philosophy from that of the romantic school mainly on the ground that the latter is strongly subjective and tends towards an æsthetic philosophy of life (cf. 'The Problem of Human Life,' pp. 477-82, and 'Life's Basis and Life's Ideal,' pp. 258-61). The strong ethical bias and objective manner of Eucken make the application of the term to his philosophy particularly undesirable.

the first of his main treatises, 'Die Einheit des Geisteslebens' (1888), and more precisely formulated in the Introduction that follows. On the first page of this preface we find it mentioned, as a basic conviction, that the work of philosophy must be essentially concerned with and involved in the spiritual life and work of humanity as revealed on the large historic scale; and that no radical progress can be made in philosophical thinking till this intimate alliance is made the philosophic objective and starting-point. The author is already persuaded that to this leading idea 'the future belongs.'

The task of philosophical analysis must then be to penetrate beneath the scattered data of our superficial life to the underlying life-system, and above all to seize the life-process at work; for it is only when life and environment are co-operating in actual work that we get beyond the disruption of subject and object, and therefore into the movement of spiritual life.

The same fundamental conviction—that the concept is subordinate to the life-process, is expressed in the Author's Preface to the English translation of the 'Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker,' and compactly stated in the formula 'Conceptions are determined by life, not life by conceptions.' And it meets us again in the significant substitution of the expression 'Geistige Strömungen' (spiritual movements) for 'Grundbegriffe' (fundamental concepts) in the volume now translated under the title of 'Main Currents of Modern Thought.'*

This subordination of thought to life, of the concept to the life-process expresses, then, Eucken's conviction concerning the relation of knowledge to life. But if we are to understand the peculiar nature of that relation as Eucken conceives it, and appreciate the difficulties of a thinker committed to this 'vitalistic' view, we must not ignore the negative influences which helped to determine it. These were in the main two: (1) the reaction from Hegel's dialectic, and (2) the reaction from subjectivism. The latter he shares with Hegel himself; and there can be little doubt that Hegel's influence over him in this respect was very marked. It is of Hegel that he is speaking when he says: 'Overwhelmingly impressive is

* Translation by Meyrick Booth (Fisher Unwin, 1912).

his idea of a reality which refuses to accommodate itself to our likes and dislikes, his portrayal of the rise and conflict of independent thought-systems completely beyond the control of this school or of that.* But 'the ballet of bloodless categories' is as alien to Eucken's sense of reality as it was to Mr Bradley's; and the part played by the concept in Hegel's dialectic is transferred in Eucken's philosophy to the life-process. In harmony with this inversion we find that, whilst with Hegel the Logic is the *a priori* framework of the whole philosophy, with Eucken it is secondary, adjusting itself to the life-process and not the other way about.

As a consequence of these reactions from Hegelianism on the one hand, and Subjectivism on the other, the problem of knowledge becomes for Eucken a matter of some embarrassment. He is pledged like Hegel to seek truth by following reality. 'We shall not criticise reality from our own individual standpoint, but shall bid the facts criticise themselves, being led from appearance to true reality by the help of a dialectic immanent in the things themselves.'† But, whereas the dialectical movement in Hegel's case *is* his Logic, it is for Eucken only the vital foundation upon which a Theory of Knowledge must eventually be built up. Again, the principle of objective criticism which Eucken adopts is apt, when exclusively applied in an anti-subjective spirit, to leave the question 'What do I mean?' unduly neglected; and with this result, that not only is conceptual analysis, as ordinarily understood, banished from the dialectic of the life-process, but it is also banished in principle even as a subsidiary study; for the subsidiary work of clarifying one's own ideas is an essentially subjective function and liable to all the limitations of mere expression of opinion. Only on one condition would such clarification enter normally into Eucken's scheme; and that is, on the condition that there was underlying it a vital need, born not of any individual desire for clarity, but of some desire rooted in great historical movements. Thus the Period of the Enlightenment‡ was just such a period;

* 'The Problem of Human Life,' p. 504.

† 'Die Einheit des Geisteslebens,' p. 3.

‡ 'Die Aufklärung'; i.e. the 18th century.

and spirituality at this stage found direct expression in the elucidation of meaning. So too it was largely the privilege of Classical Antiquity to live in the conviction that the world was intrinsically rational, and needed philosophy only to bring such rationality to clear expression. Ours is no such privileged Age. There is perhaps no conviction more frequently expressed in Eucken's writings than that of the unsettled and distracted spiritual condition of our own times, times which 'have to struggle in order to safeguard even the bare possibility of a spiritual life.' What is at stake in our own day is not the security of this truth or of that, but the very fundamentals of spiritual life itself. Hence the first duty of philosophy, as an exponent of the interests of the spirit, must be to awaken in all thinking people that wholeness and inwardness of vision without which all clarification of ideas must remain a mere toying with unrealities. The New Enlightenment will have its day; it is for our time to establish the basis of the new spiritual culture whereon the future will erect its superstructures and elaborate its detailed conceptual refinements. And clearly, if it is true that life determines conception, and not *vice versa*, and that philosophy must start from the life-process, the establishing of the spiritual life of the Age on a firm foundation is the essential pre-requisite to all conceptual elaboration whatsoever.

So far we have laid stress on what we may call the *vitalistic* element in Eucken's philosophy, the appeal to the life-system as the true unit of history and the starting-point of philosophical construction. But this is only one-half of the groundwork of Eucken's thought: the other half is the *personalistic* or *activistic* element. It is in this connexion more particularly that Eucken's prophetic function appears to overshadow the philosophic. The reader is made to feel that the struggle for spiritual existence is the one indispensable thing, that apart from a fundamental and persistent decision of his whole being, a decision which identifies his destiny with that of the spiritual life, his life will cease to have meaning or value; and this inward deed is depicted as a spiritual initiation and given a far-reaching religious significance. Here the function of philosophy is to help

in the shaping of a new humanity, in the establishing of a new culture.*

It should not be forgotten, however, that the self-renewal to which Eucken calls his readers (much as Socrates called his hearers some two thousand years ago) is held to be—and the parallel with Socrates extends to this further point as well—essential to the establishing of Philosophy itself. For, if we are fruitfully to grasp the movements of the world's spiritual history as systems of life, we must ourselves, through the deepening of our own individuality, have suffered that spiritual change in the depths of our own being which can alone give us the requisite insight for recognising a spiritual drift elsewhere. Thus the vitalistic and the activistic elements are essential to each other. More particularly, the appeal to help the times by realising ourselves implies the truth that it is only from the standpoint of an eternal present that the temporal movements of history can be rightly valued and understood. And this conviction is at the root of Eucken's whole philosophy of history. Thus the vitalistic insight into the movements of the historic past becomes possible only through the activistic initiative whereby we reach the eternal in ourselves and so draw up the past, as far as may be, into living relation with the spiritual problems and issues of our own time.

This, it will be said, is 'the mystic way.' So indeed it is if to be a mystic is to apprehend the spiritual as the supremely real, and the eternal as the truth of time. And it is a way hard for the conceptual thinker. But how can philosophy avoid it if it is to be genuinely constructive? Truth for constructive philosophy must be the conceptual flower of Reality. There must be a genuine fact-world of a spiritual nature, or constructive philosophy has no *raison d'être*. Spiritual vision, mystical insight of some sort, the power to apprehend the reality of the supra-sensual, some faculty which will open up a realm of fact deeper, subtler, more inclusive than the realm of sense-perception—this seems to be essential if constructive philosophy is to be in any genuine way distinguishable from Natural Science. Criticism no doubt

* Cf. 'Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt,' p. iv.

may discuss the conditions of the sense-world's intelligibility without postulating any fact-world other than that of sense-intuition; and there are some who hold that Criticism is the only proper function of Philosophy. But criticism is not construction, and the hope of a constructive metaphysic which shall make life's deeper meaning plain to us is one not lightly to be abandoned.

The fundamental problem which faces Eucken in his Theory of Knowledge is no easy one. It is primarily that of defining the rationality proper to spiritual life as such, or to its unit, the life-process. For Eucken by his very method, at once anti-dialectical and anti-subjective, can hope to find truth only by following the thread of reason immanent in the spiritual life which he studies from within.

That reason may express itself in many ways, and that the conceptual medium as ordinarily understood is but one among many forms of rational expression, will, I hope, be readily admitted. We can be rational without being impelled by some form of intellectual curiosity. Fine Art, for instance, is eminently rational; but its rationality is not expressed through the medium either of science or philosophy. A symphony, a statue, or a cathedral may be models of achieved expression; and to seek to enhance their expressiveness by philosophising over their perfection is surely to confuse two very different things—the masterpiece and the problem. The thing of beauty is a joy for ever. And if the philosopher's thought is so abstract that it cannot understand how a beautiful thing can be at heart anything but a problem, it must be very near the desiccation-point indeed. And yet, though it is no intellectual *chef-d'œuvre*, the masterpiece remains rational, intrinsically, some would say superlatively, rational. And what is true of Art, where the emotional life in conjunction with the imagination holds the intellect, the theoretical reason, subservient, is true also of conduct. Here volition takes the lead, and life is so oriented that the emotions and the intellect enrich and illumine the aims of the will. As a result we have the life of the statesman, the soldier, or the man of business. But the will, even the noblest will, is rational, not in the way of the intellect nor in that of sensibility, but in its own peculiar way. The

statesman, for instance, will maintain the rationality of compromises which to the intellectual consciousness are anathema and reduce it to confusion. We might even venture to affirm with some show of justice that contradictions of ideas, conceptual paradoxes, antinomies of the understanding, are congenial and stimulating to the volitional reason. When the will encounters a direct contradiction, it cries out, Well! here at last we have a clear issue; and it feels at once at home with its work ready to its hand.

Art, then, working through sensory media, and conduct working through action have their own special rationalities, not to be confused with the rationality either of science or of philosophy. Even the rationality of one fine art is distinct from that of its sisters. The poet who wished to write verses for Mendelssohn's 'Songs without Words' received from the composer the apt reply that music as a tone-medium was so lucid a form of expression that words could only obscure it. Again we may take Abt Vogler's exclamation, 'The rest may reason and welcome; 'tis we musicians know,' and ask, 'How can the musician know?' Quite easily, we see, if under knowledge we include all types of rational insight; for then the musician will know in his own artistic way, though his insight never reasons. That is, he is not only sure, but his assurance is grounded in the logic of Art, a logic which finds its ultimate and convincing expression in the musical masterpiece. It is through such logic of Art that Beethoven, to quote his own conviction, 'proves' in the ninth symphony the existence of God. On the other hand, the musical theorist who distinguishes between noises and sounds, harmonies and melodies, points and counterpoints, and thinks out the function of the *Motiv* in a Wagnerian opera—he also knows, but his logic finds expression in some form of conceptual order. I understand that music, he says, and no doubt truly; but it is not as the musician but as the theorist.

We are thus driven to recognise the pervading and operative presence of reason in spheres which diverge from those of the intellectual consciousness proper. Indeed it is the failure to recognise this distinction between reason and intellectual reflection which so perplexes the great problem of Truth. Keats, with the

conviction of poetic insight, assures us that Beauty is Truth and Truth Beauty; and the Master of those who love is reported by His mystical interpreter as saying, 'I am the Truth.' On the other hand, Truth, for the scientist at any rate, is an exclusively intellectual standard; and any infusion of the artistic or personal equation is a poison to be eliminated from the scientific system. The question here is: Are we to define Truth as an ideal of the Reason generally or as an ideal of the Intellectual Consciousness in particular? If we adopt the former alternative, then the universe itself will be, if rational, an expression of Truth, and every great concert a magnificent revelation of discovered verities. If we adopt the latter course, we shall perhaps call the universe good, and the concert a revelation of beauty, but we shall not refer to these as true.

What name shall we give to this Reason which aspires after beauty, knowledge, perfection, but in each of these directions evolves a different medium of expression, here a work of art, here a system of concepts, here a code of life? Eucken would call it Religion, Religion in its universal form. For this, with him, is the vital principle of every organised system of life. Every such system, or process, has a manifold rational expression; it has its own distinctive type of art, science and conduct; but the principle which animates all these departments without either losing itself in any one of them or imperilling its freedom, and, in addition, has a characteristic form of self-concentration and of self-expression—the way of holiness, the life of the saint—is Religion.

Religion, in its more universal form at least, is thus the common life from which art, conduct and philosophy derive their varied inspirations. And this fundamental experience has a rationality *sui generis*, a generic rationality capable of being specialised in conformity with any one of the great spiritual ideals. It is the rationality of the Good, shall we say; and the rationalities of art, conduct and philosophy are but its varied specifications.

Now it seems to me that the force and distinctive value of Eucken's philosophy lie in the intimate alliance it sets up between the theoretical reason and this more fundamental religious rationality of the spiritual life in

its inwardness, its wholeness, and its unity of impulse. The vital apprehension of the spiritual in its fundamental religious form, that *élan vital* of the reason in which our impulse of spiritual self-preservation consists, is what Eucken calls faith. Faith 'precedes all reasons,' 'refusing to be analysed into reasons.' Now let this creative reason, as we might call it, be developed in a theoretical direction, let it blossom into an impulse for conceptual order, refusing no longer to be analysed into reasons, and we have the birth of a religious idealism. And if the personalistic note is further emphasised, if the religious reason, the reason of faith and of love, is explicitly identified with the insight of freedom, an insight won through the struggle for spiritual existence, then we have Activism, Eucken's distinctive 'profession of faith.'

And surely this is a noble conception of philosophy. It presents philosophy to us as at once the child of thought and the grandchild of faith, thought at its logical origin being the theoretical reason disengaging, following up, and conceptualising the thread of rationality which runs through faith. And with this view of the philosophic reason as the intimate synthesis of faith and intellect we have a correspondingly vital conception of the meaning of Truth. Eucken's first main treatise 'Die Einheit des Geisteslebens' might well have been entitled 'The Problem of Truth.' 'Life,' we read, 'has first to seek itself, its unity, its perfection; and it is just this that is the problem of truth.' Truth is 'an upward endeavour of life to its own unity.'

We return, then, in the end to the query with which we started, and ask in what sense we can justify Eucken's Activism as a genuine philosophy? We must, I think, understand it as an alliance of the theoretical with the creative reason, and judge of its conceptual performance from this point of view. For the alliance implies a constant adhesion to what is inward and total and makes for unity, a sense of kinship with the non-conceptual systems of art and morality, and an ultimate dependence on the intrinsic rationality of the *élan religieux*. If this is not philosophy in the 'strict theoretical sense,' it is because it is something more fundamental. Philosophy, as Eucken conceives it, is still theoretical; but the inclusion of the activistic imperative as an essential element in its

structure disables it from being abstractly, and in this sense strictly, theoretical; it necessitates its being practical as well. But it is precisely through its intimate union of theory with practice on the one hand and with mystical insight on the other that Activism makes to many of us so profound an appeal. We stand in need of a practical philosophy of life, of a philosophy which takes us as we are, heirs of the past and makers of the future, places us in our historical and cultural setting, shows up the great organised movements out of which our civilisation has arisen and within which it is still operative for good or for evil, sets before us a clear live option between the rule of Nature and the rule of Spirit, and calls us to register our decision daily and hourly, if need be, in token of continuous loyalty to spiritual ideals.

Eucken's philosophy is precisely of this kind, and it is lit up from first to last with a profound belief in the reality, intrinsic supremacy, and full independence of the Spiritual Life. It is the privilege of philosophy, as here conceived, to make this vision convincing to the reason, to instil theoretical illumination into the warmth of practical conviction, and to infuse itself into life in such a way that reasoning over the fundamentals of existence, instead of having a withering influence on behaviour—as it so easily tends to have—shall become, in theological language, a means of grace strengthening the sinews of action. Philosophy, as Eucken conceives it, is no mere reflection upon life, as though life were of itself complete without the reflection. It is rather a vital function of our spiritual activity. It is that form of spiritual vitality which brings to coherent expression the intuitions of experience. As such we welcome it, and Eucken's own exposition of it in particular, as the most suitable rallying-point for the deeper thought of the present day.

W. R. BOYCE GIBSON.

Art. 6.—THE LETTERS OF THOMAS GRAY.

1. *The Poems of Mr Gray, to which are prefixed Memoirs of his Life and Writings.* By W. Mason, M.A. York: Todd; London: Dodsley, 1775.
 2. *The Works of Thomas Gray.* Edited by Edmund Gosse. Four vols. London: Macmillan, 1884.
 3. *Gray and his Friends. Letters and Relics in great part hitherto unpublished.* By Duncan C. Tovey. Cambridge: University Press, 1890.
 4. *Gray's English Poems.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by D. C. Tovey. Cambridge: University Press, 1898.
 5. *Gray's Poems, Select Letters and Essays.* Introduction by John Drinkwater. (Everyman's Library.) London: Dent, 1912.
 6. *The Letters of Thomas Gray, including the Correspondence of Gray and Mason.* Edited by D. C. Tovey. Three vols. London: Bell, 1900-1912.
 7. *Gray.* By D. C. Tovey. Cambridge History of English Literature. Vol. x. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.
 8. *Essays and Criticisms by Thomas Gray.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by C. S. Northup. Boston, U.S.A.: Heath, 1911.
 9. *A Concordance to the English Poems of Thomas Gray.* By A. S. Cook. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, 1908.
- And other works.

'It has ever been a hobby of mine, though perhaps it is a truism, not a hobby, that the true life of a man is in his letters. . . . Not only for the interest of a biographer, but for arriving at the inside of things, the publication of letters is the true method. Biographers varnish, they assign motives, they conjecture feelings, they interpret Lord Burleigh's nods; but contemporary letters are facts.'

So wrote that most acute of disputants and dialecticians, yet withal that most sincere of souls, Cardinal Newman. Are letters always facts? Is Cardinal Newman's statement a truism? What does another even more typical, if very different Englishman say?

'There is, indeed, no transaction which offers stronger temptations to fallacy and sophistication than epistolary intercourse. In the eagerness of conversation the first emotions of the mind

often burst out before they are considered ; in the tumult of business interest and passion have their genuine effect ; but a friendly letter is a calm and deliberate performance in the cool of leisure, in the stillness of solitude, and surely no man sits down to depreciate by design his own character.'

Such is the language of Dr Johnson weighing the testimony of Pope's letters—of which Gray by the way said they were not good letters but better things—and challenging the view which he says 'has been so long advanced as to be commonly believed,' that 'the true character of men may be found in their letters, and that he who writes to his friend lays his heart open before him.' Which is the true or the truer statement? The Oxford prose-writers, whether saint or sage, disagree; the truth has been beautifully and characteristically conveyed by a Cambridge poet. It is the same poet who in his youth had graphically described the letters of his lost friend Arthur Hallam, as

'Those fall'n leaves which kept their green,
The noble letters of the dead :'

speaking, fifty years later, after life's full experience, of letters generally. In his old age, Tennyson wrote the fine Sonnet, intended originally to form the prelude to his 'Becket,' which very appropriately appears at the head of his son's Preface to his own Life.

'Ye know that History is half dream—ay even
The man's life in the letters of the man.
There lies the letter, but it is not he
As he retires into himself and is :
Sender and sent-to go to make up this,
Their offspring of this union.'

Lord Tennyson's son, after quoting these lines, declares that the real life of his father is to be found in his poems. 'In these we must look,' he says, 'for the innermost sanctuary of his being.' The real Tennyson, then, his son tells us, is more truly to be found in his poems than in his letters. But is the real Gray, it may be asked, to be found more truly in his letters or in his poems?

The truth of letters, it is obvious, must depend mainly on the sincerity and directness of the writer. 'Language was given us,' as we all know, 'to conceal our thoughts';

and the pen would certainly seem to have been given to some men to paint themselves very differently from what they really are. 'In Gray's Letters,' writes Mr Duncan Tovey, 'his life lies spread out before us. They are the only absolutely trustworthy record for his biographers.' Is that so? the reader will enquire. Was Gray a sincere, direct, truthful person? His own sketch of his own character, written in 1761 when he was 45, and found in his pocket-book, is well known.

'Too poor for a bribe, and too proud to importune;
He had not the method of making a fortune;
Could love, and could hate, so was thought somewhat odd;
No very great wit, he believed in a God:
A place or a pension he did not desire,
But left church and state to Charles Townshend and Squire.'

His poems are few and brief, many are fragmentary, some are translations, of many of them much is imitation. The letters are certainly greater in bulk and touch on a far larger variety of subjects. Shorter or longer, however, it will be found in the end, that about their author the two tell essentially the same tale. 'Gray never spoke out.' This chance phrase, used upon the instant by his friend and executor Brown, Master of Pembroke, just after the poet's death, and meant probably only to explain the unpreparedness of his friends for that sad and sudden event, has been made famous by Matthew Arnold. He employed it *more suo* as the text for his well-known disquisition on Gray's poetry. In his poems, as Arnold reiterates and ingeminates, Gray 'never spoke out.' Did he then speak out more clearly in his letters? The question is the more interesting when it is considered what Gray really is among poets. He is the most polished yet the most popular, the most scholarly and yet the most sincere of them all. That he should be the former seems natural. He was learned, fastidious; he was the very *ne plus ultra* of what is called 'academic.' About the fact of his popularity there is, it may be assumed, no doubt. Yet even this is easier to assume than to prove.

Gray's Poems are, as all know, a school-book; but school-books are not always popular, though they may, because they are so well suited to their function, have an immense vogue. There are, of course, some notable

testimonies to his popularity. There is the famous story of Wolfe reciting the 'Elegy' on the eve of capturing Quebec, and saying to his brother officers that he would rather have written it than take the town—a story which received recently, by the discovery of Wolfe's own copy of the 'Elegy,' very interesting support. But soldiers are often the simplest of men, and have been known to admire very poor, not to say bad, poetry: Tyrtæus, though he served his turn, is not perhaps in the first rank of the immortals. There is the testimony of that other Cambridge scholar and critic of more recent days, a poet himself and writer of scholarly letters, an academic *virtuoso* among non-residents, as Gray was among residents. Edward FitzGerald loved Gray and writes often about him. He speaks, as everyone does, about the incomparable merit of the 'Elegy.'

'As to Gray—Ah, to think of that little Elegy inscribed among the Stars, while —, — & Co. are blazing away with their Fireworks here below. I always think that there is more Genius in most of the three volume Novels than in Gray: but by the most exquisite Taste, and indefatigable lubrication, he made of his own few thoughts, and many of other men's, a something which we all love to keep ever about us.'

A year earlier FitzGerald had written to Professor Cowell about the 'Elegy.' 'Plenty of faults: but one doats on almost every line, every line being a Proverb now.' And again in those 'More Letters,' which the Vice-Master of Trinity accorded later to a delighted and still unsated public, FitzGerald writes:

'Mr Lowell lately observed in a letter to me, what a Pity that so few were of Gray's mind in seeing how much better was too little than too much. But I fancy Gray would have written and published more had his ideas been more copious and his expression more easy to him. Dickens said that never did a poet come down to posterity with so little a Book under his Arm. But the Elegy is worth many Volumes.'

This is a good criticism, but another probably even better is made, in FitzGerald's quiet *obiter dictum* kind of way, and is about a poem less universally admired, 'The Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College.' FitzGerald has been to Windsor and he writes:

'The view from the Terrace is the noblest I know of, taking it with all its associations together. Gray's Ode rises up into the mind as one looks around—does it not?—a sure proof that, however people may condemn certain conceits and expressions in the poem, the spirit of it is genuine. "Ye distant spires, ye antique towers"—very large and noble, like the air that breathes upon one as one looks down along the view.'

'The spirit of it is genuine.' FitzGerald might have amplified this text. At the end of the MS. of the Ode Gray adds: 'At Stoke, Aug. 1742.' The significance of the date is not small. Some two months before, Gray had received back a letter containing his first poem unopened, and inscribed upon the piece the melancholy entry: 'At Stoke. The beginning of June 1742, sent to Fav: not knowing that he was then Dead' and had thereafter written his second piece, the Sonnet on the 'Death of Richard West.' As Mr Tovey writes, 'The personal element in this, and in the following Ode, the Hymn to Adversity, are of the strongest.'

Wordsworth, as is well known, made this Sonnet the text of what may be called his 'Sermon on the Sin of Poetic Diction.' He pronounced that the only lines of any value were three in the middle, and two at the end, and that in these five selected lines the language differed in no respect from that of prose. It has perhaps not been pointed out before, that Wordsworth missed the beautiful word 'require.' 'A different object do these eyes require.' For this word is surely not used in any ordinary prose sense, but is a most felicitous echo of the Latin use to be seen in Virgil's 'Amissos longo socios sermone requirunt.' The words 'complain' and 'descant,' also *exquisita verba*, occur in the lines which Wordsworth considered of no value. They are part, no doubt, of what he calls 'gaudy and inane phraseology.' But what Wordsworth still more strangely missed was just this personal element, when he implied that Gray's 'eyes were not on the object.' Not on the object! Those eyes that could scarcely see for tears, that voice that for sobbing could hardly speak 'its deepest grief of all.' Mr Tovey judges more truly. 'The spontaneous tributes, English and Latin, to the memory of West, both so instinct with genuine sorrow.' So he writes of them.

The personal element—that is their real secret. ‘*Tout le reste est littérature,*’ in Verlaine’s phrase. There is, it is true, ‘literature’ enough in Gray, but there is a sufficiency of the personal element to carry all the ‘literature.’ This is what was felt by other poets both about Gray’s poetry, and about his prose. It was felt, not only about his poems, but about his letters, by Cowper—that Cowper whom it is so natural to compare with him, whose own scholarship and sincerity inform every line of the correspondence, to which so many readers have been turning again in the delightful selection recently given them by the author of the ‘Golden Bough.’ Cowper’s letter about Gray is very characteristic. It is not long, and may best be quoted *in extenso*.

‘TO JOSEPH HILL, ESQ.

‘April (I fancy the 20th) 1777.

‘MY DEAR FRIEND,

‘Thanks for a turbot, a lobster, and Captain Brydone; a gentleman who relates his travels so agreeably, that he deserves always to travel with an agreeable companion. I have been reading Gray’s Works, and think him the only poet since Shakespeare entitled to the character of sublime. Perhaps you will remember that I once had a different opinion of him. I was prejudiced. He did not belong to our Thursday society, and was an Eton man, which lowered him prodigiously in our esteem. I once thought Swift’s letters the best that could be written; but I like Gray’s better. His humour, or his wit, or whatever it is to be called, is never ill-natured or offensive, and yet, I think equally poignant with the Dean’s.—I am, yours affectionately,

‘WM. COWPER.’

‘Poignant,’ he calls them—equally poignant with the utterances of that fierce heart, eternally lacerated by *sæva indignatio*, poignant because profoundly, piercingly felt—it is a strong expression, but not stronger than, not so strong as, the language of another even more passionate poet, whom the reader would less expect to find an admirer of Gray, but who was in fact an enthusiastic admirer, and an unrestrained defender of his faith and admiration, the poet Burns. The story is told in Lockhart’s Life.

'At a private breakfast' (he says), 'in a literary circle of Edinburgh, the conversation turned on the poetical merit and pathos of Gray's *Elegy*, a poem of which he was enthusiastically fond. A clergyman present, remarkable for his love of paradox, and for his eccentric notions upon every subject, distinguished himself by an injudicious and ill-timed attack on this exquisite poem, which Burns, with generous warmth for the reputation of Gray, manfully defended. As the gentleman's remarks were rather general than specific, Burns urged him to bring forward the passages which he thought exceptionable. He made several attempts to quote the poem, but always in a blundering, inaccurate manner.

'Burns bore all this for a good while with his usual good-natured forbearance, till at length, goaded by the fastidious criticisms and wretched quibblings of his opponent, he roused himself, and with an eye flashing contempt and indignation, and with great vehemence of gesticulation, he thus addressed the old critic: "Sir, I now perceive a man may be an excellent judge of poetry by square and rule, and after all be a d—d blockhead."

What was it Burns admired? It was not Gray's classic lore, or artistic technique, or polished style. What it was, Burns tells us himself in that thrice interesting autobiographic piece which all young poets should be recommended to read, the '*Vision*.' The Scottish Muse shows him his own limitations and inferiorities. He cannot, she says to him, 'pour, with Gray, the moving flow warm on the heart.' It was Gray's passion, his sincerity, that attracted Burns. It is well known what Burns thought of pedant poets, of those who, as he says:

'Confuse their brains in College classes,
They gang in stirks, and come out asses,
Plain truth to speak;
An' syne they think to climb Parnassus
By dint o' Greek!'

'Pouring the moving flow, warm on the heart.' This is hardly what we generally think of Gray, the stately, classic Gray, as doing. But it was what Johnson thought and expressed when, convinced against his will, he wrote what was his last word, and *the* last word on Gray. And it is the truth. '*Proprie communia dicere*,' to utter what is common to all, but in our own way. This is a great

secret of poetry. But, as Horace goes on to say, it is a secret difficult to put into practice.

Superficial observers think of Gray as mainly artificial, imitative, academic, removed from the realities. Like the 'three Lords at the York races,' who, as he said, declared that he was 'impenetrable and inexplicable,' they find fault with his language as abstruse and dark, unnatural and over-elaborated. But simpler folk somehow understand it for what it is, not for its derivation. Johnson, for instance, censured, as everyone knows, the expression 'many-twinkling.' Gray defended it, in anticipation, by quoting Homer. Mrs Garrick, who was not a Greek scholar but had been a French ballet-dancer, cut the matter short. 'Greek as the expression is,' writes Walpole, in a sprightly letter to Lord Lyttelton, 'she was struck by it and said, "Mr Gray is the only poet who ever understood dancing."' It is the same all through his work. Some of the most effective touches in the world-famous 'Elegy' are conscious imitations of Dante or Lucretius. They are admired by thousands, perhaps millions, to whom Lucretius and Dante are sealed volumes.

Wordsworth indeed undertook to show that the language of the 'Elegy' was unintelligible. But, as Hazlitt drily remarked, 'It has been understood.' Landor knew better than Wordsworth; and so did Tennyson, who, with that 'curious felicity' of his, equal to Gray's own, quoted to William Allingham, 'The paths of Glory lead but to the grave,' and then added, 'These "divine truisms" make me weep.' No, Gray was a scholar, a savant, a connoisseur, a virtuoso, a don, even a professor—some will add, a pedant and a prig. But he was also a man of the world, and what is more, a man; a man of warm heart, strong feeling, and strong sense, affectionate, natural and sincere.

This is indeed just the paradox of Gray. This is the problem of his literary career. This is his interest for the student of the poetic character, his special interest for the Universities. Why did Gray achieve so little, why did he achieve so much? Why did he succeed where scholars and savants fail? why did he fail where poets of far less culture and accomplishment succeed? This is what we turn to the letters to discover. We

possess them now in a most complete and readable form. They have always been read, and have indeed always been popular. It is significant how from the first they have been preserved. The first editor was, of course, Gray's friend Mason. He has been much censured, and he courted censure, for he transformed and transposed and even garbled, to suit his own designs. Mason was followed by Mitford, a careful, affectionate, and independent worker, who did much to supply the defects of Mason and deservedly held the field for many years. Half a century later, came a young student of English literature, Mr Edmund Gosse. He first wrote the *Life of Gray* for the well-known series of 'English Men of Letters,' and then edited the entire works of Gray in four volumes. For both these efforts not a few, especially of his contemporaries, must always feel much indebted to him. They may have the faults of a young man's work, but at least they have the qualities of their defects, and charming qualities they are, in particular those of bright, light, sprightly, sympathetic handling and appreciation.

Then in due time succeeded Mr Duncan Tovey. To him it is impossible for any lover of Gray to express his gratitude adequately. Alas that it has had to be spoken over his new-made grave! Two years before his death he wrote to Mr John Murray to thank him for the loan of the MS. of Gray's *Journal of travel*. 'I am printing it,' he said, 'in my third volume, and am nearly at the end of my long and weary voyage.' However weary, he spared no pains and grudged no time.

Mr Tovey had many advantages. He was the right man for the task, and he went the right way to work, capturing one by one the outlying points of vantage before he made his full frontal attack upon the main position. He was a son of Cambridge; he was, if not an Etonian himself, at any rate an Eton Master. He could interpret without assistance such a letter as that of Walpole's to George Montagu, about Eton expressions, and needed no comment to tell him what is meant by 'being in a bill for laughing in Church,' or 'shirking,' or 'funking over against a conduct.' He could feel and understand the never-failing affection of the 'Quadruple Alliance' for their mother.

His latest work of all was the chapter on Gray which he supplied for the Cambridge History of English Literature. The controllers of this monumental and invaluable work are to be congratulated on having secured this 'magistral' contribution, drawn, before it was too late, from its author. As their touching Prefatory Note to the volume indicates, they were only just in time, and Mr Tovey never saw the proofs of his chapter. It rests on all his previous work, on the complete and definitive edition of the letters which he had just concluded, and on a wide and laborious scrutiny of the parallel and contributory literature. Much had been done by others, as he was the first to acknowledge, in the quarter of a century or thereabouts during which he worked at his favourite author. Notably the vast collection of Walpole's letters had been reduced to order and accessibility, by a gifted lady whom also lovers of Gray have to mourn, Mrs Paget Toynbee. Dr Birkbeck Hill had given to scholars his epoch-making editions of Boswell's 'Life of Johnson,' and of Johnson's 'Lives of the Poets.' The 'Dictionary of National Biography' had rendered incalculable service to all students of our national history and literature; and much had been done for the history of Cambridge by various hands, and in particular for that of Gray's first college, Peterhouse, by Dr Walker, of that Society. Nor should the work be forgotten which has been done in America by scholars like Professors Kittredge and Phelps, and recently Clark S. Northup and Albert S. Cook.

We have then to-day the *corpus* of Gray's known letters, arranged, annotated, elucidated, treated as what they truly are, a classic. The interesting and deserved discovery by Dr Paget Toynbee, made while these pages were being passed through the press, of more than a hundred letters written by Gray to Walpole, the third of which are new to the world, may possibly slightly alter some of the judgments passed on Gray. Their main effect appears to be to show the intimacy and influence of Walpole to have been greater than was hitherto recognised. We can trace the poet's quiet career, the 'noiseless tenor of his way' along the 'cool sequestered vale of life,' his occasional excursions into the 'madding crowd,' whose 'strife,' if sometimes 'ignoble,' was also

amusing and exciting. They show him first as an undergraduate, exchanging, as Cambridge and Oxford undergraduates have done in every generation, and it may be hoped will always do, epistles and jests, verses and versions, in English and Latin, French and Greek, perhaps in Italian too.

The 'Quadruple Alliance'—Plato and Almanzor, Oros-mades and Tydeus, Zephyrus or Zephyrillus, *alias* Favonius and 'Fav:'—what year by Cam or Isis does not know their analogues? It is half amusing, half depressing, to read these early letters. They want, unless it be those of Walpole, the gusto of youth. There are indeed some first 'sprightly runnings' of the new wine of life, but the dash of bitter is too strong. The melancholies, or 'leuchocholies,' to use Gray's own word, the 'green-sickness' of this spring-time, are indeed familiar to University seniors, who have seen it in many generations of young men. There is the usual mixture of desperate despondency with cheerful confidence and even coxcombry, all the critical 'infallibility of the youngest among us.' Cambridge, we there read, is the 'abode of dragons,' 'the Babylon of which the prophet spoke.' Oxford is no better, 'a strange country inhabited by things that call themselves doctors and masters of arts, a country flowing with syllogisms and ale, where Horace and Virgil are equally unknown.' It is to be doubted whether the Oxford owls match those at Cambridge, but owls there certainly are in both places. Both are under the 'leaden sway' of that 'wayward queen,' 'the hyp,' and of mathematics. This complaint about mathematics is of special interest. It lasted on for a century. It is found again in Macaulay's undergraduate letters. It is found in those of Tennyson. It is not 'compulsory Greek,' but compulsory Mathematics of which youthful poets complain.

Some truth there no doubt was in this caricature of Cambridge, as in Gray's later satiric sketches. We know both the Oxford and the Cambridge of that time best from caricatures, which show their superficial characteristics, their wigs, their waddling obesities, their guzzlings and fuddlings, their pretension and place-hunting. 'Old Fobus' owl's nest,' Gray used to call Cambridge in later days—language somewhat ungrateful from the

nightingale whom that nest nursed so snugly. But we must remember that both Gray and Walpole had a strong satirical turn. 'Gray wrote nothing easily,' said Walpole, 'except the humorous.' The poet, it must be remembered, has by his nature the gift for strong language; well for him and for his fellows if he does not use it too freely. All know and lament the strong language of Milton, who is, truth to tell, when he abuses Salmasius, 'not less than Archangel ruined.' Tennyson gave the world, once or twice, a glimpse of what he could easily have achieved in this line, and so did Browning. Swinburne wrote the scathing epigrammatic only too easily. So doubtless did Gray; and his admirers may probably thank Mason that they have not more of the squibs that he sent flying about the University. His own letters tell how alarmed he was—as well he might—by the divulgence of the terrific lines on Lord Holland.

Meanwhile the youthful letters of this little set show already the same characteristics as appear in those which the survivors wrote later—a keen zest for scholarship and literature, a lively interest in politics and art and music, a certain æstheticism withal, and an affectation of finical foppery and acquaintance with fashion and the talk of the town. As Walpole wrote to Mason nearly forty years later, after Gray's death,

Gray 'came perfect out of the egg-shell and wrote as well at eighteen as ever he did; nay, letters better, for his natural humour was in its bloom, and not wrinkled by low spirits, dissatisfaction, or the character he had assumed.'

Let the reader take this of West's:

'I long to compare Colleges. I must absolutely take the measure of King's College Chapel. Have you any such walks as Maudlin? and then I want much to see Dr Bentley, the *ὁ πᾶν* Commentator.'

Let him read Walpole's first letter to Gray. It is an amusing parody of Addison's 'Classical Tour,' describing a journey to Cambridge, a singularly scholarly letter for a young 'blood' of 1738. Or take Gray's first letter from Cambridge to Ashton. This is no doubt half ironical.

'Has Mrs L. a pimple upon her nose? does her woman love Citron Water? &c. any of these would be a high regale for

me. . . Have you seen Madame Valmote? naughty woman! was you at the Christening? . . . was you at the review? have you wrote e'er a critique on the Accidence? Is Des-pauterius or Linacer most in your favour?

An odd letter for a young scholar.

'Lord, Child!' 'Good night, child!' So they address each other. This habit of fashionable grammar, fashionable *argot* and fashionable topics, naturally more predominant in Walpole, is to be found also in Ashton, and never altogether left Gray, whose foible was to be a 'fashionable' among scholars, and a scholar among 'fashionables.' This was the Gray of the Ode to Walpole's Cat, and still more of the 'Long Story,' the Gray who could entertain and be entertained by Lady Cobham and Lady Brown and Lady Schaub, and Madam Speed, with her Greek quotation, so pretty on her lips, and her French airs, and her English good nature, the 'affected creature' afterwards to figure as 'Madame la Baronne de Peyrière,' and 'Madame la Comtesse de Viry,' and 'a prodigious fine Lady, with a cage of foreign birds, and a piping bullfinch at her elbow, two little Dogs in a cushion on her lap, a Cockatoo on her shoulder, and a slight suspicion of Rouge on her cheeks.'

'Gray is at Burnham, and, what is surprising, has not been at Eton. Could you live so near it without seeing it? That dear scene of our Quadruple Alliance would furnish me with the most agreeable recollections. 'Tis the head of our genealogical table, that is since sprouted out into the two branches of Oxford and Cambridge.'

So Walpole. But Gray was otherwise employed at Burnham. In the letters we see him, in the Long Vacation, sitting—'ME, I,' as he quaintly styles himself, 'il penseroso,' 'sub tegmine fagi'—reading his Virgil under the venerable beech-trees, and 'other very reverend vegetables, that like most other ancient people are always dreaming out their old stories to the winds.'

'And as they bow their hoary tops relate
In murm'ring sounds, the dark decrees of fate,
While visions, as poetic eyes avow,
Cling to each leaf and swarm on every bough.'

We see him at Cambridge, 'swinging from Chapel or

Hall home, and from home to Chapel or Hall,' scanning the humours and fun of Midsummer Common or Stourbridge Fair, struggling, when the time comes to 'go down,' with the dust of departure, 'the old boxes, bedsteads and tutors all about his ears,' yet finding time even then to send to West a version of a scene from 'Pastor Fido,' which he had perhaps read with that Signor Piazza, with whom we know he and Walpole toiled at Italian 'like any dragon.' 'Pretty Mr Gray,' his tutor had been tempted to call him, when Gray in his foppish slang wrote to request him to give himself the trouble of 'writing out my Bills and sending 'em.' 'If Piazza should come to you, you'll be so good as to satisfie him; I protest I forget what I owe him, but he is honest enough to tell you right.'

Then comes the Grand Tour, which made him a citizen of the world and for the time something like a real man of fashion. We see him landing, seasick, and in an April blizzard, at Calais, posting through the snow to Boulogne, on past Abbeville and Amiens to Paris, where the son of the Prime Minister introduced him to the gaities and grandeurs and gentilities of French society before the Revolution, to theatres and Museums, palaces full of pictures, Versailles and all the rest. We see him at Rheims, after cards and a midnight supper set by the side of a fountain and under trees, dancing under the summer dawn, with 'the music in the van,' through the principal streets, waking everybody in the town, like undergraduates returning from a ball at Commemoration or Commencement. He passes Dijon and Lyons, visits the Grand Chartreuse, Aix, Annecy, Geneva; then, in the early autumn, with Livy under his arm, and Cæsar in his chaise, crosses the Alps, while a great wolf dashes out from the forest and carries off Walpole's fat little spaniel Tory. Then by Genoa, Piacenza and Parma to Reggio and Modena, to Turin, to Bologna and Florence, where he eats 'mustard and sugar with a dish of crow's gizzards,' and at last reaches Rome, and enters struck dumb with wonder. Art and Nature, History and Science all alike engage and entrance him. 'There is a moon! There are stars for you! Do not you hear the fountain? Do not you smell the orange flowers?' So he scribbles.

But through it all he does not forget his old friends, and some of the most touching of his letters are those written amid this whirl of excitement. There is the letter to Ashton, the somewhat unworthy Ashton, written from Rheims, where he was so frivolous and so merrily occupied, beginning

'I am not so ignorant of Pain myself as to be able to hear of another's Sufferings without any Sensibility to them, especially when they are those of one, I ought more particularly to feel for.'

As he put it later :

'To each his suff'rings : all are men,
Condemn'd alike to groan,
The tender for another's pain,
Th' unfeeling for his own.'

There is the long letter from Florence to West on the 'choice of a profession.' This is truly a most remarkable letter to have been written by one young man of twenty-four to another. For its mature wisdom and persuasive common sense, it might have come from Jowett or Henry Sidgwick. It is written to persuade West not to give up law for the more seductive and flowery paths of poetry and *belles lettres*. (It should be read by every undergraduate who hesitates, as many do, at the parting of ways, and by every senior who has to advise or persuade the young.)

It is impossible, within the compass of an ordinary article, to give anything like an adequate account of Gray's letters. 'Their interest,' says Mr Tovey, 'lies in their infinite variety.' This is somewhat strong language, and in it Mr Tovey does less than justice to Walpole, who, moving in the great world, had more of the world's gossip, which Gray also delighted to transmit or record. Walpole also had very various interests, and not a little of Gray's taste and wit. If Gray's touch was firmer, Walpole's was lighter. Mr Tovey is more correct in saying that Walpole's letters contain nothing comparable to the depth and pathos of Gray's more limited memories and friendships. The terse pronouncement by an earlier Cambridge critic, of scholarly, well-read, eminently masculine mind, judicial alike by heredity and training, is more precise.

Gray's 'letters' (says Mr Leslie Stephen in his excellent article in the *D. N. B.*) 'are all but the best in the best age of letter-writing.' They are fascinating not only for the tender and affectionate nature shown through a mask of reserve, but for gleams of the genuine humour which Walpole pronounced to be his most natural vein.

Some serious faults, let it be said at once, they have. We must remember the character and colour of the times, the middle of the 18th century. We have only to read some of the books which belong to, or describe, the period, to see that there was in it much brutality, coarseness, corruption and venality, not all concealed 'in the decent obscurity of a learned language.' What Matthew Arnold calls so aptly 'Hogarthian touches' were natural in the days of Hogarth. But it must be admitted that too many stain the pages of Gray's letters, even as they stain here and there the designs, which he thought so admirable, of Richard Bentley.

Gray has been sometimes twitted with effeminacy. A little more fastidiousness and effeminacy—or rather refinement, for the women were little better than the men—a little more fastidiousness would have become 'pretty Mr Gray' and prettier Mr Walpole, still more the not so pretty Mr Mason. But these friends were refinement itself compared to George Selwyn and his brother Mohocks with their disgusting practical jokes. Let the reader turn again the pages of that most brilliant of torsos, later so oddly completed, into which Gray's scathing lines are so tellingly introduced, the first volume of Sir George Trevelyan's 'Early Life of Charles James Fox,' and see what was in those days the tone not only of the dining-room, not to say the club or the race-course, but even of the drawing-room, and then he will judge more fairly of the Cambridge depicted in Gray's letters.

No, on the whole, notwithstanding the 'Hogarthian touches,' Cambridge comes out very well, in this record of one of the best of her characters in the 18th century. It was not Cambridge, it was not the epoch at which his life fell—Mr Tovey has amply proved this point—nor any 'moral or spiritual east-wind then blowing,' which stunted, as Matthew Arnold thought, Gray's growth or 'froze the genial current of his soul.' It was his own

temperament and prevailing bent. Some are born to acquire, some to produce, few, very few, to do both. Walpole put the matter in a nutshell when he wrote nearly twenty years after his friend's death, 'Mr Gray often vexed me by finding him heaping notes on an interleaved Linnæus, instead of pranking on his lyre.'

The Cambridge he describes so satirically was no bad place. The Heads of Houses, upon whom he wrote his satirical lines, may have been pompous and pretentious; they may have expected, as he wrote to Wharton, a 'certain deference and even servility in their medical men,' as did Bishops and Deans; their ladies may have been 'squeezy,' whatever that means—probably straightlaced*—the Professors may have been, some of them at least, perfunctory, the average dons often, as Gray would say, 'nothing bright,' the undergraduates sometimes rowdy, horsy, or worse; but Gray certainly found friends, and good friends, among each of those classes. Writing to Beattie toward the end of his life, he spoke of the Cambridge residents generally, as 'a set of men among whom I have passed so many easy, and I may say happy, hours of my life.'

De Bonstetten, it is true, was oppressed at first sight by the monastic gloom of Cambridge, that 'cloister where the fifteenth century was still in possession, where memories of monks of old reigned side by side with the glories of Newton.' He thought that Gray languished for want of female society. 'No lady ever came,' he says, 'to enliven the life of these bookworms in human form. Science sometimes prospered in this desert of the heart. Gray, condemning himself to live at Cambridge, forgot that the genius of the poet languishes in such dryness of the affections.' Bonstetten did not know that Gray could, on occasion, find lodgings 'over the way' for Mrs Nicholls, the mother of his young friend, though it is true he thought them rather inadequate for a lady of fashion.

'Such an entry, such a staircase! How will Mrs N. be able to crowd through it? with what grace, when she gets out of her chair, can she conduct her hoop-petticoat through this

* The Dialect Dictionary gives 'squeeze' as being used in Cornwall for an 'old frump.'

augrehole and up the dark windings of the *grand escalier* that leads to her chamber? . . . is there room for Mrs Kipiffe, Mamma's Maid? I am sure I know not.'

He enjoyed, as the letters show, his changes into the country, his visits to Mason at Aston and Wharton at Old Park, where he made friends with the children, poor short-lived little Robin, and 'Debo,' and taught them to collect and to dry plants, and sent them kisses by letter, and as they grew older still kept up with them.

'Has Miss Wharton served her time yet as a Bride-maid? I hope it may prove a good omen to her! does Miss Peggy rival Claude Lorraine yet, and when does she go to York? do Debo and Betty tend their Chrysalises, and their samples? Is Kee's mouth as pretty as ever? does Robin read like a Doctor, dance like a Fairy, and bow like a Courtier? Does Dickey kick up his heels, and study Geography?'

He enjoyed his jaunts to Stoke, his mild flirtations with good-natured, witty, blooming Madam Speed;

'Melissa is her Nom de Guerre.

Alas, who would not wish to please her!'

his visits to his young undergraduate friends, Norton Nicholls at Blundeston and Lord Strathmore at Glamis, where Beattie, asked to meet him, was agreeably surprised with his affability. In his younger days he sometimes sighed for these changes from his 'cell,' as he called it.

'I have been in Town,' he writes, 'flaunting about at public Places of all kinds with my two Italianized friends. The world itself has some Attraction in it to a solitary of six years' standing; and agreeable, well-meaning people of sense—thank Heaven there are so few of them—are my peculiar Magnet. It is no wonder then if I felt some reluctance at parting with them so soon, or if my spirits when I returned back to my cell, should sink for a time, not indeed to Storm and Tempest, but a good deal below Changeable.'

Want of funds to some extent accounted for his retired life. He was not in distress, Walpole said, but his means were slender. 'How pleasant it is to have money, heigh-ho!' sang Clough.

'It is a foolish Thing,' writes Gray, 'that one can't only not live as one pleases, but where and with whom one pleases, without Money. Swift somewhere says that Money is Liberty; and I fear money is Friendship too, and Society, and almost every external Blessing. It is a great tho' ill-natured Comfort to see most of those who have it in Plenty, without Pleasure, without Liberty, and without Friends.'

This was written in December 1746, when Gray was thirty and after he had been back in Cambridge just four years.

It is sometimes thought that Gray disliked the undergraduates and that they were a ruffianly lot, whose only appreciation of the shy and shrinking genius was shown by their decoying him in the dead of night to descend his fire-escape in his night-gown, and tumble into a butt of icy cold water. This good—or bad—college story, is now understood to be, like most such, much exaggerated. Gray was to a certain extent 'ragged,' and, because the ragging was connived at or condoned, migrated from Peterhouse to Pembroke. But the 'boys,' as he calls them—and they were but boys—interested and attracted him much, as his letters and Mr Tovey's illustrations amply show. His reputation for genius, wit and omniscience might over-awe them, his lightning look, his 'folgorante sguardo,' might alarm the young Etonian freshman, Norton Nicholls; but 'his courtesy and encouraging affability soon dispersed,' as that young man said, 'every uneasy sensation and gave him confidence again.' In a delightful letter Nicholls introduces another youth with whom Gray formed in his last years a strikingly close friendship, Charles-Victor de Bonstetten, the lively young Swiss, who, as Sainte-Beuve says, never grew old—so little so that, when he was over seventy, he jumped out of a first-floor window to escape from a bore who had button-holed him. The letter, written in his bad, misspelt English by Bonstetten to Nicholls, beginning 'Hence vain deluding joys is our motto hier, written on every feature and ourly spoken by every solitary Chapel bel,' with its postscript by Gray, is one of the most illuminating and engaging pieces in the whole collection.

The poet had, it is true, a horror of fire, and not without cause, as the following letter may show.

' TO THE REV. NORTON NICHOLLS.

' 28 Jan: 1768 P: Coll:

' DEAR SR.

' I and mine are safe, & well, but the chambers opposite to me (Mr Lyon's), wh. were getting ready for Mason, are destroy'd. Mr Brown was in more immediate danger than I; but he too is well, and has lost nothing. We owe it to Methodism, that any part (at least of that wing) was preserved: for two Saints, who had been till very late at their nocturnal devotions, & were just in bed, gave the first alarm to the college & the town. We had very speedy and excellent assistance of engines and men, and are quit for the fright, except the damage above-mention'd. I assure you it is not amusing to be waked between 2 & 3 in the morning, and to hear, "Don't be frightened, Sir! but the college is all of a fire."

A separate treatise might, and perhaps should be written on Gray as a literary critic. Prof. Northup's scholarly little volume, in which for the first time the appreciation of the poet Daniel appears, indicates what might be done. Here, too, the letters offer rich material, beginning with the wonderful youthful letter to West on the language of poetry, so far superior in knowledge and discrimination to the Preface in which Wordsworth holds Gray up to scorn, and ending with the letters to Beattie. The 'Progress of Poesy,' that beautiful composition with its beautiful name, both parts of which should be given their full meaning, so happily employed by Prof. Mackail in his lectures at Oxford, was no chance or hasty improvisation. It rests on a profound knowledge of the general history of European literature, a knowledge of which some glimpses are given both in the Remains and in the Letters, and in particular on the accumulations which Gray had intended to use for that projected 'History of English Poetry'—derived in slight measure from Pope—which he handed on to Thomas Warton.

It is possible that the depth of Gray's scholarship has been exaggerated. A letter preserved in that treasure-house, Nichols's Literary Anecdotes, records that 'Cambridge, in 1758, was divided between the "polite scholars" and the "philologists";' and that the 'former, at the head of which was (*sic*) Gray, Mason, etc., superciliously confined all merit to their own circle and looked down with

fastidious contempt on the rest of the world.' This attitude, however, may well have been merely Gray's pose. He told Walpole that 'learning should never be encouraged,' as it 'only drew out fools from their obscurity.' Dr Walker has shown that he ignored scholars like Jeremiah Markland. Yet, if the well-known testimony of Temple and Potter be partial or doubtful, Oxford will not reject that of Fynes Clinton, who says that, had Gray completed his chronological Tables, the 'Fasti Hellenici' need not have been written, or his own Cambridge the verdict of that magnificent scholar, the late Master of Trinity, who wrote of Gray's notes on Plato that they were 'so much to the purpose that he regretted they were not more numerous,' or that of her present learned Public Orator, Sir John Sandys, who, in his 'History of Classical Scholarship,' quotes Parr as saying that 'Gray was one of the first persons in England who well understood Plato.'

Of his wide reading and culture, however, there can be no doubt. Prof. W. P. Ker, in an article in the volume of the Cambridge History which contains that on Gray by the late Mr Tovey, draws out the insight of Gray into the Icelandic poetry and tongue. Nor can there be any doubt about his fine critical gift, and what Mr Drinkwater calls his 'clear-sightedness as to the general principles of his craft.' He was not infallible; no critic is. He was, oddly enough, to some extent mistaken, though not altogether so, about a poet destined to be forever associated with him, the poet Collins. Many know the passage in the letters in which Gray refers to Collins, but it is so interesting and amusing that it will always bear repetition. 'Audiat qui nunquam audivit, quique audivit, audiat!'

'Have you seen the Works of two young Authors, a Mr Warton & a Mr Collins, both Writers of Odes? It is odd enough, but each is the half of a considerable Man, & one the counterpart of the other. The first has but little Invention, very poetical choice of Expression, & a good Ear; the second a fine fancy, model'd upon the Antique, a bad Ear, great variety of Words, & Images with no Choice at all. They both deserve to last some years, but will not.'

More than a score of years ago I had the pleasure of

asking Tennyson his opinion of Gray and Collins. I said that I should like to agree with Swinburne in thinking that Collins was a truer poet than Gray, for Collins was a member of my College, but I could not honestly do so. I asked him what was his view. I was delighted to find how high he put Gray, for whom I had always entertained the highest admiration. He dwelt especially, I remember, on the superiority of Gray's ear. I said I was very fond of Collins' Elegy on Thomson. In reply he quoted lines from both poets. 'Collins,' he said, 'was a beautiful poet, but he wrote some terribly ill-sounding lines;' and as an example, he noted in this very piece, which in many ways he, like myself, admired much, the line, 'The year's best sweets shall duteous rise.' Gray on the contrary, he said, had a fine ear; and he quoted as an instance the famous lines about the Theban eagle. The same fault is found by Johnson, who speaks of Collins' verses as 'impeded by clusters of consonants.'

Much has been written about the general tenor of Gray's life. It is best described in his own language. In a letter to Wharton dated March 8, 1758, when he was a year or two over forty, he writes:

'It is indeed for want of spirit, as you suspect, that my studies lie among the Cathedrals, and the Tombs, and the Ruins. To think, though to little purpose, has been the chief amusement of my days; and when I would not, or cannot think, I dream. At present I find myself able to write a Catalogue, or to read the Peerage book, or Miller's Gardening Dictionary, and am thankful that there are such employments and such authors in the world. Some people, who hold me cheap for this, are doing perhaps what is not half so well worth while. As to posterity, I may ask (with somebody whom I have forgot) what has it ever done to oblige me?'

It was not an heroic life. It had its limitations, and its temptations. And yet for Gray it was not, when all is said, what it might appear, a *vie manquée*. More and more he was true to himself. His was the 'private happiness' which he had decried to West but had chosen for himself. He was 'employed, and he was happy.' The trumpet-call to arms which summoned Milton, the call to which Mark Pattison thought he should have been deaf, but to which he listened so heroically, never

came to Gray. A romanticist in the age of reason, he lived his days in the quiet of Cambridge. She was kind to him; she gave him shelter, leisure, the opportunity of learning; and in the end he found in her system both emolument and position, the best she had to give. When he was appointed professor, he wrote to Beattie, evidently pleased and excited beyond his wont:

'It is the best thing the Crown has to bestow (on a layman) here. The salary is 400*l.* per ann: but what enhances the value of it to me is, that it was bestowed without being asked. . . . As I lived here before from choice, I shall now continue to do so from obligation.'

Amplly he repaid her. He refused the laurels of the Court, but he became, and of his own impulse, the laureate of his own 'kindly Mother,' and wrote for her the shining and the stately lines which every other University must envy. It is not the moody, vacillating, 'young mannish,' 'Hymn to Ignorance'—though oddly this too echoes the phrases, English and Latin, of Milton—but the lines, the 'Air' as he terms it, which he places in the mouth of that greatest of Cambridge poets, that shows the real and the final Gray. Who does not know it, be he son or only sister's son?

'Ye brown o'er-arching groves,
That contemplation loves,
Where willowy Camus lingers with delight!
Oft at the blush of dawn
I trod your level lawn,
Oft woo'd the gleam of *Cynthia* silver-bright,
In cloisters dim, far from the haunts of Folly,
With Freedom by my side, and soft-eyed Melancholy.'

Surely if these lines are, as they are, successful, it is because, like all really successful poetry, they are true and sincere.

Gray lived the life of a celibate don of the old style—so we see him in his letters—and yet lived a first-rate life and achieved the highest greatness; not money or worldly power, but esteem, fame, even glory, nay, and not those only, but something better still, really high and lasting influence. He is a standard and a force for good, throughout the ages. Few with so few words have

availed so much to reconcile class with class, and man to his earthly lot of life and death. He showed, alike in his poetry, in his letters, and in his prose remains, how 'even in a College life may be lived well,' how 'from a College window' a delicate and pensive student may have an outlook not only far into the past, but deep into the present, may be inspired by, and may inspire, his age.

'Ah! two desires toss about
The poet's restless blood;
One drives him to the world without,
And one to solitude!'

Matthew Arnold felt the latter impulse, but yielded to the former. Gray for a moment, in his youthful years, coquetted with the former, but wedded for life with the latter. 'Was man in der Jugend wünscht, hat man im Alter die Fülle'; and the realisation of age often only reveals at the last what the prevailing passion was from the first.

Gray affected at times to dislike Cambridge; but his secret desire was for her tranquil, sheltering shade. The youthful prayers of his 'Stanzas at the Grande Chartreuse' were answered to this ascetic, academic, fastidious, spirit, by his returning to her.

'Saltem remoto des, Pater, angulo
Horas senectæ ducere liberas;
Tutunque vulgari tumultu
Surripias, hominumque curis.'

'Far from the haunts of Folly.' 'Far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife.' Such is the note from first to last, whether in English or in Latin, whether in youth or in age, the 'frugal note' it may be, but the firm and faithful note, of Gray.

'Far from the haunts of Folly,
With Freedom by my side, and soft-eyed Melancholy.'

T. H. WARREN.

Art. 7.—THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND.

1. *Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls, Ireland, 23-31 Edward I.* Edited by James Mills. Dublin: H. M. Stationery Office, 1905.
2. *Statutes and Ordinances and Acts of the Parliament of Ireland: King John to Henry V.* Edited by Henry F. Berry. Dublin: H. M. Stationery Office, 1907.
3. *Statute Rolls of the Parliament of Ireland: Reign of King Henry the Sixth.* Edited by Henry F. Berry. Dublin: H. M. Stationery Office, 1910.
4. *Ireland under the Normans, 1169-1216.* By Goddard Henry Orpen. Two vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
5. *Revolutionary Ireland and Its Settlement.* By Robert H. Murray. London: Macmillan, 1911.
6. *The Life of James, First Duke of Ormonde, 1610-1688.* By Lady Burghelere. Two vols. London: Murray, 1912.
7. *The Beginnings of Modern Ireland.* By Philip Wilson. Dublin and London: Maunsell, 1912.

It has been the policy of generation after generation of English statesmen to create out of Ireland another England. For centuries Englishmen have been content, with this object in view, to pour out their blood and treasure like water; and to-day they are compelled to admit their failure. We ourselves have seen the downfall of the Irish Church, and we are now witnessing the expropriation of the descendants of those Englishmen who, at much peril to themselves and much suffering to the Irish, were planted there as the representatives of English civilisation in the 16th and 17th centuries. We are sorry for them. We think they have been scurvily treated. No doubt there were bad ones among them—rotten members who deserved to be cut off; but the bulk of Irish landlords were sound—too sound in fact for their own interests. They would be neither ‘degenerate English’ nor ‘King’s rebels.’ They sought to be true to the connexion at the risk of forfeiting the adherence of their tenants, and they are paying the penalty of their loyalty. We will not say that they are blameless—far from it; but, with Grattan’s warning ringing in our ears, we are bound to ask whether we, as Englishmen, are not

mainly responsible for their fate. We carried the Act of Union over their heads and against their wishes. We appealed to their lowest instincts to support a policy their consciences condemned. We urged the incapacity of the Irish Parliament to rule Ireland. We seized the occasion of a rising, hardly to be dignified as a rebellion, to put an end to its legislative independence.

To-day we are compelled to admit our own failure. We are going to repair the mistake we made in 1801. But let us not be under the delusion that by so doing we can set back the clock of history. The Ireland of to-day is a very different country from the Ireland of the latter part of the 18th century. The balance of power has shifted into the hands of the democracy, and we have no longer a landed aristocracy on which we can reckon to control the destinies of the country. It remains to be seen whether our new friends are so entirely loyal to the connexion as they would have us believe, or whether in fact they will have the power to keep their promise.* But, in meditating on the fate that has overtaken the English colony in Ireland, we are forcibly reminded that it is not the first time that England has sacrificed her own flesh and blood to the exigencies of a false line of political conduct. The history of the first English colony in Ireland—of that colony that came in with Henry II and received its deathblow in 1691—is not so well known that we need offer an excuse for attempting to trace the causes of its downfall. Its lessons come unfortunately too late to possess any practical value, but for those who desire '*rerum cognoscere causas*' the enquiry is not without interest.

* Those who, like the present writer, have lived for years in a clergy-ridden country and have witnessed the ineffectual efforts of a liberal minority to influence legislation, will feel the force of Prof. Mahaffy's remark in his interesting Introduction to Dr Murray's '*Revolutionary Ireland*' (p. xx). 'People commonly believe that the power of the clergy cannot but wane with the spread of secular education. I . . . have watched for fifty years the effect of so-called modern enlightenment on the clergy and their flocks. I cannot but say that the current expectations have been disappointed.' Englishmen, in their blessed ignorance of their own happy condition, are a little too apt to judge the world by their own limited experience. For those who live under different conditions a prophet's vision is not necessary to enable them to see that for many a year to come Home Rule will practically, as the phrase runs, mean Rome Rule for Ireland.

The origin of that colony has recently been written afresh by Mr Goddard Orpen. Mr Orpen is not one of those writers who think it necessary either to their own reputation or to the cause of Irish history to upset all our traditional notions as to what that history actually is. He is content to take his facts as he finds them and to accommodate his views to his facts. For him Giraldus Cambrensis is still a credible authority, not merely as to events of which he was an eye-witness, but also in regard to matters which he had to take on trust. The 'Expugnatio Hibernica' remains the chief source of our knowledge of what is perhaps the most important event in the history of Ireland since the arrival there of the Celt.

The mischief, if such it is to be accounted, began on that May-day morning in 1169, when Robert Fitzstephen, attended by a small band of armed followers (thirty knights and sixty other horsemen, and about 300 archers on foot) landed at Bannow Bay in the County of Wexford. His countrymen's curse has fallen heavily on Dermot Mac Murrough for bringing the English into the land. But Dermot was merely the occasion, not the cause of the invasion. The attempt was bound to have been made sooner or later. Norman, if not actually Anglo-Norman influences, as seen in the abbeys of the Cistercian order,* had long been at work; and it was a mere accident that had prevented Henry II from taking advantage some years earlier of Adrian's famous donation. Circumstances favoured the invaders. The friendship of Mac Murrough secured them a firm footing in Leinster; the sparsely populated country afforded them ample elbow-room; new arrivals added to their numbers and increased their strength; the natives, distracted by their own dissensions, armed with inferior weapons and without a leader of unquestioned ability and authority, fled from them like chaff before the wind. Their rapid progress and the marriage of their leader, Strongbow,

* The list of Cistercian abbeys in Ireland founded between 1139 and 1170 is a long one. It includes St Mary's, Dublin; Mellifont in Louth; Bective in Meath; Baltinglas in Wicklow; Boyle in Roscommon; Monaster-Nenagh in Limerick; Athlone in Roscommon; Newry in Down; Odorney in Kerry; Innislonnagh in Tipperary; Fermoy in Cork. We cannot help expressing our regret that this side of his subject has been entirely overlooked by Mr Orpen.

with Mac Murrough's daughter, Eva, awakened Henry's jealous fears lest the enterprise he had permitted should result in the establishment of an independent Anglo-Norman kingdom in his rear. He no sooner realised the danger that menaced him than he took steps to counteract it by preventing further assistance reaching Strongbow and by recalling those adventurers who had taken part with him in his enterprise.

On Oct. 17, 1171, he landed at Waterford at the head of an army sufficiently imposing to overawe the Irish and to convert what was intended as a conquest into something resembling a royal progress.* He had two objects before him, viz.: (1) to get himself generally recognised by the native chieftains as their over-lord, and (2) to provide against the possible contingency of the establishment of an independent Anglo-Irish kingdom. At the time the latter was the more important. Accordingly, while he consented to recognise the claims of Strongbow and his companions to the lands they had acquired and to confirm them in the possession of them by an act of feudal donation, he took the precaution to retain the chief seaports in his own hand and to appoint a visible representative of the authority of the Crown in the person of a justiciar or viceroy. So far as the management of the internal affairs of the colony was concerned, it was to be based on the polity of England. In other words, what Henry seems to have had in view was the extension of the colony till it embraced the whole island, or, to express it more accurately, the absorption of the whole island within the limits of the polity, which he had marked out for the colony. He had made no conquest of Ireland, but such a contingency was amply provided for in the 'territorial letters of marque'† granted by him and his successors to such adventurers as were willing to take the risk of conquest on themselves.

* We do not follow Mr Orpen's argument that the late period of the year is of itself sufficient proof that Henry did not meditate 'forcibly imposing his rule over the Irish.' That the necessity for such a proceeding did not arise is quite another matter; as for the time of the year, Henry had apparently little choice. Cf. Stubbs' 'Const. Hist.,' ch. xii, § 143.

† This useful phrase owes its origin, we believe, to the late Prof. George Stokes, whose merits as an historian have been strangely underrated.

It is a favourite theory with modern writers, but one to which Mr Orpen lends no countenance, that Henry completely misunderstood the problem that confronted him in Ireland. We do not think he did; we believe that in treating O'Connor as the lord paramount of Ireland, and O'Brien, O'Rourke and the rest as his vassals, holding their lands directly under him, he was nearer the actual reality than those writers who, basing their conclusions on evidence drawn from an earlier (and later) period, insist so strongly on the theory of tribal ownership. The only question of importance for Henry, as it had been for O'Connor, was the power to enforce his authority. Henry fully recognised the fact, but it affected him less from the side of the natives than from that of the colonists. When he left Ireland he appointed Hugh de Lacy his viceroy. But the arrangement did not entirely satisfy his jealous fears; and, at a Council at Oxford in May, 1177, he announced his intention of creating his youngest son, John, King of Ireland.* The consent of Urban III was obtained, and preparations were made for John's coronation in 1187. But the final step was never taken; and the government of Ireland continued, as it had begun, to be exercised by a justiciar. Though greatly impeded by the habitual absence of the sovereign, the progress of the colony was most remarkable. When John visited Ireland, in 1210, the entire coast from Carrickfergus southwards as far as Cork was in the possession of the new settlers. Leinster and Munster were dotted with colonies; and the invaders were rapidly pushing their way westward through the great central plain of Connaught. In 1216 the limits of the colony had been practically reached.

In his concluding chapter Mr Orpen sums up the

* Mr Orpen suggests that in the account given of the Oxford Council in the 'Gesta Henrici II' we should read 'dominium' instead of 'regem,' and he points out that these titles do not differ so much in degree as in character; 'rex' being a national title, 'dominus' a territorial. Perhaps so; but the words of the chronicler are precise, and for ourselves we think 'rex' is a higher title than 'dominus.' 'Dominium' Henry could and did confer on John, but he could not make him 'rex' without the Pope's consent. It should be noticed in this connexion that Richard never was 'dominus Hiberniæ,' and that Edward I occupied the same position as John during his father's lifetime.

results of the forty-five years that elapsed between the landing at Bannow in 1169 and the death of John in 1216. As regards the vexed question of the treatment of the Irish by the invaders he is of opinion that, where the latter succeeded in asserting their power, the chief, whether of a sept or group of septs, was as a matter of course deprived of his position. Where he resisted the invaders he either fell in the conflict or was expelled or perhaps retired into a monastery. In most cases, however, he submitted to terms and was accorded a portion of his former territory, where he continued to rule according to Irish law. As for the actual tillers of the soil, however, every inducement was offered them to remain on the newly settled land. Their position on the whole did not differ greatly from that of the English villeins; and it is therefore, as Mr Orpen points out, somewhat unreasonable to expect from the Normans that they should have granted them as a body liberties which they had not enjoyed under their former chiefs and to which they would not have been entitled in England. No doubt, as he suggests, a more liberal treatment of the free-born Irish would have been to the ultimate benefit of the colonists; but we cannot agree with him that their neglect in this respect is to be traced to the fact that the Normans regarded the Irish as an uncouth and barbarous people and the fit spoil of their conquerors. So far as we can see, there was not any such general antipathy between the Normans and the Irish as showed itself at a subsequent period between the latter and the Elizabethan planters.

Here, as elsewhere, we must distinguish between political, legal and social rights. Politically, of course, the Irish could have no claim to consideration, but, so long as all political power rested with the sovereign, this was a matter of no great importance. Legally only those of them who belonged to the 'five bloods'—the O'Neills, O'Briens, O'Melaghlin, Mac Murroughs, and O'Conors—in itself no small concession) could plead in a court of law; but it should be noted that a practice of enfranchisement tended to widen this circle. Socially, however, there was, so far as we can see, no great disparity at first between the two races. Every conqueror feels himself, of course, a superior person; but marriages

such as that between Strongbow and Mac Murrough's daughter were not uncommon in higher circles; and, even if it is true, as Mr Orpen says, that there was no general clearance of the native population, and that there is no sign of any considerable influx of foreigners into the rural parts of Ireland, it follows as a natural course that there must have been a considerable mixing of the two races.

By the end of John's reign the limits of the colony had been practically reached. The period of invasion and expansion was followed by one of consolidation and internal development. During nearly the whole of this period (1216-1314) Ireland was left mainly and with apparently satisfactory results to herself. Unfortunately it is a period of which historians have had little, or little of importance, to tell us. The reason of their silence is not far to seek. Until quite recently our materials for a history of the English colony, from the point where Giraldus breaks off till Bruce's invasion and even later, have been scanty in the extreme. But with the publication of Dr Berry's 'Early Statutes' and Mr Mills' 'Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls,'* a considerable stride has been made towards a systematic study of a very obscure but none the less important period of Irish history. When we get Mr Mills' long promised edition of the 'Gormanston Register,' and when the Pipe Rolls are taken in hand, we shall be in a better position than we now are to form a distinct picture of the social, legal and industrial life of the times. Meanwhile, even with the documents we possess, it is clear that we must abandon the view of the period as being one of prolonged discord, intestine quarrels, and misrule. To go no further than the Irish annals, we can see that, despite the rivalries of the De Lacies, De Burghs and Fitzgeralds, and the constant fighting that was going on in the Marches and in the territories of the Irish, the colonists had got a firm

* The space at our disposal prevents us entering into anything like an adequate review of these two important works. They labour under the disadvantage of being semi-official publications, and like all such publications they have received scant recognition from the accredited organs of historical opinion.

grip of the country, and that the prospect of bringing the whole island under their control was not so fanciful as is generally supposed. Under the year 1248 the *Annals of the Four Masters* inform us:

'Another army was led by the Lord Justice of Ireland into Tyrone, against O'Neill. The Kinel-Owen held a council, in which they agreed that, as the English of Ireland had, at this time, the ascendancy over the Irish, it would be advisable to give them hostages, and to make peace with them for the sake of their country' (Vol. iii, p. 329).

To the student familiar with the history of a later period it is strange to read at this time of punitive expeditions into the very heart of Tyrconnell and Kerry. But it is only when we turn to the Irish Statutes and the Justiciary Rolls that the nature and scope of the English ascendancy becomes apparent.

It is, as Dr Berry says, still uncertain at what period and even in what reign royal ordinances completely yielded to the more constitutional authority of parliamentary enactments. Judging from the documents before us, it would seem as if the first assembly entitled to rank as a parliament belongs to the year 1297 (not 1295 as generally stated), when, in addition to the bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons and chief persons of the land, the sheriffs of Dublin, Louth, Kildare, Waterford, Tipperary, Cork, Limerick, Kerry, Connaught and Roscommon, and the seneschals of the liberties of Meath, Wexford, Carlow, Kilkenny and Ulster were required to cause two of the most honest and discreet knights of the several counties and liberties to be elected to act in behalf of the whole community of each county and liberty. In 1310, in addition to the counties and liberties, each city or burgh was required to return two citizens or burgesses to represent them in the parliament summoned to meet that year at Kilkenny. The intermediate stage, of which we hitherto knew nothing, is marked by the parliament summoned to Dublin in 1300 for the purpose of voting a subsidy to assist Edward I in his war against Scotland. Between the time of issuing the writs and the meeting of that parliament, the Justiciar, John Wogan, we are told, decided to discuss the subsidy with the mayors and good men of the cities and burghs.

'Afterwards came to the aforesaid Parliament the magnates and communities in the manner commanded. And divers of them, excusing themselves from giving a subsidy, asked that the Justiciar should go through the counties, and they would willingly assist, that the communities in their own persons should grant that they would give the subsidy. . . . And the Justiciar, consenting to them, went first to Trim' ('Early Statutes,' p. 233).

From this account it seems clear that it was simply to avoid this wearisome perambulation of the country by the Justiciar that, in the next parliament (1310), the cities and burghs were required to send each two persons properly elected to represent them in matters concerning the country. Thus, at the beginning of the 14th century, Ireland, or rather the English colony in Ireland, had acquired the same degree of constitutional government as England itself. There had been no transference of institutions. The constitution as settled in 1310, though no doubt based on the English model, was purely local in origin and due to the necessity felt by the Crown of consulting all classes of the community in the matter of taxation.

But, if Ireland had got a parliament of her own, this did not imply that she was free to do as she liked. By what we may call the fundamental law of the connexion (King's Writ, 30 Hen. III, confirming an Ordinance of John) all laws made in England were of force in Ireland. The passage reads as follows :

'Forasmuch as for the common benefit of the land of Ireland and the unity of the King's dominions . . . it is provided that all the laws and customs which are observed in the kingdom of England should be observed in Ireland, and the said land should be subject to the said laws, and should be ruled by the same, as the lord King John, when he was last in Ireland, ordained and ordered to be done' ('Early Statutes,' p. 35).

Subsequently, in 1460, as we shall note, it was claimed that no law made in an English parliament was binding on Ireland unless the same had been expressly confirmed by the Irish parliament. But, as Dr Berry points out, this claim was vitiated by the fact that it was made by a parliament held by Richard, Duke of York, at a time

when he had been proclaimed a rebel in England. In fact, a candid reading of the documents before us can, we think, only lead to the conclusion that a confirmation by the Irish parliament of laws made in England (though often directly required by royal writ) was not necessary to their validity in Ireland. So long as England and Ireland were agreed in their general policy, complete harmony prevailed. It was only when civil dissensions arose in England, one party following the white, the other the red rose, that the relations between the two countries became strained, and the question of the dependence or independence of the Irish parliament became a matter of importance. Down to that time no one had doubted that the Irish parliament was competent to legislate for Ireland, though not to the exclusion of the English Parliament, when it saw fit to interfere.

The interest attaching to the Statute Rolls is of course mainly constitutional. For a fuller view of the social life of the times we must turn to the Justiciary Rolls. A mere glance at Mr Mills' Index, under the heading 'Social Incidents,' is better calculated to enlarge our view of the conditions of life within what was called 'the land of peace' than any history we know of. Is it a father, who having sold the marriage of his son, carries him off and marries him to the daughter of another person, or a band of murderers who escape punishment owing to the bailiff of the town kissing each on the cheek, or an archbishop brought to book for placing Connaught under interdict and boycotting the Friars Preachers, or a pirate being liberated on condition of assisting the King in his war against the Scots, or a woman of English race acting as spy for O'Dempsey, we feel that, however different the world has grown, it is with human beings and human interests that we are dealing. Some day perhaps an Irish Maitland will arise who will explain these things to us and revivify the dry bones of legal facts. Meanwhile the general impression left on us by a study of these documents is that, so far as the territory occupied by the colonists was concerned, we have to do with a well organised, prosperous and fairly populous community. In contradistinction to the territory still in the occupation of the Irish, it was known as the 'land of peace'—the land where law and order prevailed and life

was secure, and men could pursue their avocations as farmers, tradesmen and artisans, as they did in England. Justice followed swiftly on the footsteps of the offender; and, if the invidious distinction between 'hibernicus' and 'anglicus' was still maintained, the law saw closely to it that, when an injury was alleged, full and ample proof was made that the sufferer actually lay outside the pale of justice. Evidence is here in full that the slightest claim to the benefit of the law was readily admitted.

Between the 'land of peace' and the 'land of the mere Irish' lay the Marches. These did not, as is generally supposed, form a continuous line. Even in the 'land of peace' itself there were districts where the King's writ did not run; and these districts were also known as the Marches. Various reasons have been propounded to explain why the Normans failed to effect a complete conquest of the island, and why, in particular, these danger zones, as we may call them, were left standing in the 'land of peace.' But the question may be raised whether they ever attempted a complete conquest. We must remember that, even a hundred years after the invasion, the colonists were numerically greatly inferior to the Irish; but it would be hard to mention any districts in Ireland at the end of the 13th century worth possessing which they had not got hold of. A state-organised undertaking might have proceeded differently, though the same mistake is noticeable in the plantation of Ulster in the 17th century; but a body of private adventurers naturally looked to their own personal advantage, and, with so much fertile land before them, there was absolutely no inducement to try to get possession of the barren mountains of Wicklow and the impassable bogs of Leix and Offaly. Perhaps from the ease with which the conquest had proceeded it was too readily assumed that, as the colony grew in population and strength, the Marches would gradually be drawn within the full control of the executive. That this day never came, but that, on the contrary, the Marches absorbed large portions of the 'land of peace,' was what no one at the end of the 13th century could have anticipated.

Opinions differ as to the causes of what was called the 'decay of Ireland,' meaning the decline of the English colony; but in general it seems agreed that the seeds

of decay lay in the constitution itself and were only developed by external causes. Richey, in his 'Short History of Ireland' (p. 186), concisely expresses this view:

'At the close of the reign of Edward I, the English influence was predominant in Ireland; but its system, political and social, was utterly rotten, and even without foreign interference could not have been permanently maintained. It was shivered to pieces by the Scotch invasion of 1315.'

Perhaps Richey was too much influenced by Sir John Davies, who attributed the decay of the colony mainly to the exclusion of the Irish from the benefit of the English law.* As a matter of fact, the Scottish invasion did not shiver the constitution to pieces. It smashed the colony, it is true. Large portions of it, as a consequence, fell away from the main body; but, where the colonists managed to hold their own, there the constitution survived. Even after the devastation caused by Bruce's invasion—from which the Irish suffered equally with the English, so that according to their own annalists no better deed had been done since the creation of the world than the killing of Edward Bruce—the mischief might have been repaired had it not been for the foreign policy of Edward III, which, by continuously draining the colony of men and money for his French wars, hastened the process of decay.

The steps in this process can be easily followed in the Statutes. Already in 1320 it was complained that bands of armed men were roving about the country, plundering and committing outrages wherever they went. In 1333 the greater part of Connaught and Ulster was lost to the colony through the murder of William De Burgh. So serious had the situation become in 1341 that, in a petition presented that year to Edward III, inviting his intervention, it was stated that a third part and more of the land formerly in the possession of the Crown had fallen back into the hands of the Irish. But Edward, immersed in his schemes of continental aggrandisement,

* The weak point of Davies' argument lies in the assumption that, because 'there is no nation of people under the sun that doth not love equal and indifferent justice better than the Irish,' they were, therefore, like him, convinced of the superiority of the English over their own Brehon law.

had no time to attend to the needs of his Irish subjects. A perfunctory reply to their petition was accompanied by a fresh demand for military aid in his war with France. The result of this constant draining of the land of its strength was not merely that the Irish were allowed an opportunity to recover the ground that they had formerly lost, but that, as the limits of the colony became restricted and life in the rural districts became unsafe, hundreds of industrious labourers fled the realm. Steps were taken by parliament to stop the exodus and to insist on landowners, even when compelled to serve abroad, providing for the defence of the country. But every effort to stem the encroachments of the Irish proved unavailing. Little by little the colonists were either driven back on Dublin, or, if they chose to remain among the Irish, forced to adopt their manner of life. For those who resided on the frontiers of what was coming to be called 'the Pale' it was only by paying for the protection of some powerful neighbouring chief that they could manage to subsist at all.

Even to a purblind government it was at last evident that the halcyon days of English supremacy were at an end, and that, if even a semblance of power was to be maintained, some remedy for the situation would have to be found. The danger was imminent and called for drastic measures. A show of force might effect something, but the most pressing necessity was that a strong barrier should be thrown up against the Irish, and that steps should be taken to preserve the colonists from those insidious Celtic influences to which they were exposed. The new policy found expression in the famous Statute of Kilkenny (1366). Far from being, as is often asserted, an arrogant assertion of superiority, the Statute of Kilkenny, rightly construed, is an abject confession of weakness on the part of the English in Ireland. Hitherto the Irish had been regarded by them with half-contemptuous indifference. One might be kind to them or kill them as the occasion demanded and opportunity served; but they were an inferior race, too insignificant to be even hated. But these times had long since passed away. The Irish had recovered from their fright. The terror was now on the side of the colonists. Apart from the risk of losing their lands, they had no wish to

be absorbed in the mass of the Irish population. They were English at heart and wished to remain English.

Whether and to what extent such measures as those collectively known as the Statute of Kilkenny—forbidding the colonists to contract marriages and other alliances with the Irish, or to adopt the Irish manner of dress, their names, laws and language, and excluding Irishmen from presentation to English benefices, and Irish minstrels, rhymers and the like from residing amongst them—were likely to effect the purpose of keeping the two races apart, depended of course not merely on the goodwill of the colonists, but even more on the ability of Government to enforce them. For, though in their corporate capacity the colonists were most anxious to keep the Irish at arm's length, as individuals they showed an alarming propensity to fraternise with them. Unfortunately the prime condition of success was seldom attainable. It was not always possible to find an Englishman of sufficient credit and wealth to undertake the government; and, as the resources of the colony declined, the practice obtained ground of entrusting it to some Anglo-Irish nobleman, who as a rule was more intent on advancing his own power than on promoting the interests of the colony. To the colonists it seemed that nothing but the presence of the sovereign could save them from destruction; and in 1385 an urgent petition to this effect was addressed by them to Richard II. But, though Richard twice visited Ireland, the good effects of his presence were soon obliterated. As in the days of Henry II, the Irish made great profession of their loyalty, even binding themselves in heavy penalties payable to the Apostolic Chamber to keep the peace. But no sooner was the King's back turned than matters reverted to their old condition.

In their exasperation at the fickleness of the Irish, the colonists, recalling the terms of their late submission, petitioned Henry V in 1421 to solicit the aid of the Pope in proclaiming a crusade against them. It is hard to imagine a more abject state of helplessness than this suggestion reveals. But, if the colonists were at their wits' end to provide for their safety, they were most scrupulous in their observance of the forms of the constitution. Though reduced to a mere shadow, parliament

continued to meet with all the regularity proper to a well-governed community. Year by year, statute-roll was added to statute-roll, with the result that Mr Berry's second volume of 800 pages is no more than sufficient for what has survived of the legislation of Henry the Sixth's reign. But the story these Acts have to tell is always the same. Measures as severe as they were ineffectual were passed to keep the Irish at arm's length; money, which it was impossible to raise, was voted for the erection of castles on the frontiers and digging trenches round the 'English county'; threats of confiscation, which could not be executed, were hurled against those who assisted the enemy. All to no purpose. Year by year the circuit of the Pale grew more restricted. Of the four counties that still professed allegiance to the Crown—Dublin, Kildare, Louth and Meath—nearly the half was at the end of Henry the Sixth's reign in the possession of the Irish. The colony was torn to pieces by war, famine and pestilence; but, with their backs up against Dublin Castle, the colonists stubbornly refused to admit defeat. Never, in fact, did they insist more fiercely on their privileges as a governing class than when their condition was most desperate. We have referred to the claim put forward by them in 1460 to legislative independence. The claim could not be historically substantiated and is no doubt to be regarded in the first place as an answer to the Act of Attainder passed by the English parliament against the Duke of York; but it shows that the colonists were growing tired of a connexion from which they derived no benefit, and that the possibility of Ireland breaking away from her allegiance and establishing herself as an independent kingdom was not a remote one. With the hour came the man. Chronologically the year 1460 marks the beginning of a new period in Irish history—the period of the ascendancy of the House of Kildare.

During the latter part of Henry the Sixth's reign the government of Ireland had rested nominally or actually in the hands of Richard, Duke of York. His appointment as Lord-Lieutenant had been dictated less by a regard for the interests of the colony than by a desire to remove a political rival. In York's absence the management of affairs had fallen mainly to the Earl of Kildare. The

result of this arrangement was twofold — first, an intimate personal friendship between York and Kildare, and, secondly, the growth of a strong Yorkist feeling in Ireland. The effect of this alliance, as it was felt in England on more than one battlefield and in the support given at a later time to the pretensions of Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck, is familiar to students of English history. It is not so well known that, so far as Ireland was concerned, the result was to throw all political power into the hands of the Kildare family.

Thomas, seventh Earl of Kildare, was an ambitious and far-sighted man. Without following the example of his kinsmen the Munster Geraldines and openly throwing off his allegiance to the Crown, his intention was, by playing the part of a loyal subject, to constitute himself the practical dictator of Ireland. To this end, and while acting nominally as the protector of the Pale, he endeavoured by every means in his power to establish friendly relations with the Irish, going so far in this direction as to marry his daughter Eleanor to the ruling chief of the O'Neills. His son and grandson followed closely in his footsteps, so that by means of one alliance or another nearly every family of importance in Ireland had, at the beginning of the 16th century, been drawn within the circle of Geraldine influence. The object of the Geraldine policy was of course too patent to avoid detection, and the pursuit of it was naturally attended with considerable risk to its authors. Earl Thomas narrowly escaped paying for it with his head. Poyning's legislation was avowedly directed to curtailing the overweening power of his son Gerald, the eighth Earl; and his grandson Gerald, the ninth Earl, was till his death in the Tower the constant object of Henry VIII's suspicions. But neither Henry VII nor (at first) Henry VIII was strong enough openly to defy the Geraldines. It may interest historians to speculate on what might have been the consequences for Ireland if the Geraldine policy had been allowed to ripen into a system. Perhaps the ideal advocated by some writers, of an Ireland developed on the lines of its own culture, might then have been realised. But before that day arrived the fatal rashness of 'Silken Thomas' (the tenth Earl) gave Henry the wished-for opportunity of interfering. The vengeance

he exacted was terrible. On Feb. 3, 1537, Earl Thomas and his five uncles were executed at Tyburn. Of all the male members of the family two helpless infants, the brothers of Earl Thomas, alone escaped. It was a fearful blood-bath, but it was one which in the circumstances could hardly have been avoided if Henry was to achieve his purpose of restoring the Crown to its legitimate position and of preventing Ireland from establishing herself as a hostile neighbour.

The downfall of the House of Kildare marks the beginning of modern Ireland. The subject is one which has recently attracted the attention of Mr Philip Wilson. Mr Wilson writes as an Irishman, but, unlike most Irish writers, he is far too earnest an historian to occupy himself in drafting theories pleasing to patriotic prejudice. For ourselves we know no book which displays a firmer grasp of the problem in all its aspects as it confronted Henry VIII and his immediate successors than does 'The Beginnings of Modern Ireland.' We do not profess to agree at all points with Mr Wilson. Such a passage as the following may have expressed the views of a certain class in Ireland, but we hardly think that the 'consolidation of the clans,' which Mr Wilson regards as a possible alternative, was in any case capable of realisation:

'The task of welding together the discordant elements of Irish life, although less hopeless than has sometimes been supposed, required an amount of tact and patience, a sincerity in dealing with the native chieftains, and a respect for the native usages of which few English statesmen were capable, as well as a continuous attention which no English statesman was able to give. It was easier, so long as no immediate danger threatened, to retain the name, while neglecting the duties of government, and to foster disturbances which might prepare the way for future conquest. The consolidation of the clans would have been fatal to this benevolent purpose, and no effort was spared to prevent it. The aim of the King and his advisers was not the restoration of order but the perpetuation of anarchy, and they interfered with just sufficient energy and frequency to prevent the native chiefs from governing the country' (pp. 79, 80).

To the chief of a clan, local interests are always paramount; and it would probably have passed the

wit of the most benevolent statesman to reconcile the conflicting interests of the O'Neills and O'Donnells in regard to Inishowen or of the O'Donnells and O'Conors in regard to Sligo. But a consolidation of interests (as apart from clans) might have been possible if some one man of the character and influence of the great Earl of Kildare had taken the matter in hand, though in that case consolidation would practically have meant absorption; and even then it may be doubted whether the consolidation would have proved more than temporary.

We are more at one with Mr Wilson in his strictures on the way in which it was attempted to force the Reformation on the Irish. Unlike many writers, he is under no delusion as to the quality of the religion professed by the Irish before Henry's breach with Rome. But he does well to remind us that indifference in religion may be changed into downright hatred when that religion is associated with tyrannical government; and his remark that a few more years of Mary's reign might have converted the Irish into good Calvinists is not so absurd as it at first sight appears. All the same we cannot think—and Mr Wilson seems inclined to admit as much himself—that the question of religion was one of prime importance during the period of which he treats. The real danger for the future—and we are glad Mr Wilson has grasped the fact so firmly—lay in the rise of a bureaucratic system of government worked by English officials. The danger is not so apparent in Henry's reign as it is in Elizabeth's; but the evil that was to lead to the Irish Rebellion, the Cromwellian Settlement, and the downfall of the Anglo-Irish colony, had even then taken root in the country. We quote the following passage for future reference :

'At an earlier period the English residents in Ireland had been accustomed to regard the native population as fit objects for oppression and plunder; but time had greatly softened these animosities, while the civil and military officials sent over from England did not trouble to discriminate between the different classes of inhabitants, but treated the mere Irish and the old English of the Pale with impartial injustice. Religion was now accentuating the differences between the new and old colonists, and obliterating those between the latter and the Celts' (p. 230).

The downfall of the House of Kildare produced a tremendous sensation in Ireland; but, so far as the colonists were concerned, there is good ground to believe that Henry's active intervention was not altogether unwelcome. Indeed, they might well have thought that, by relieving them from the attacks of the Irish, it would redound to their political and material advantage. But in this view of the situation they were reckoning largely without their host. For, to put it plainly, the primary cause of Henry's intervention was not, as they supposed, the welfare of the colony but the interest of England. No doubt, if things had gone on smoothly and complications between the Crown and the natives, leading to costly military operations, had not arisen, their expectations might have been realised. Unfortunately the effects of the Geraldine policy survived the downfall of the House of Kildare. A formidable conspiracy in the interests of the exiled head of the family was happily nipped in the bud; but the sympathies of the natives and particularly of Brian O'Connor for the Geraldines led to more than one armed demonstration on the borders of the Pale, which in turn produced retaliatory measures on the part of the Crown, ending in the confiscation of a large part of what is now the King's and Queen's counties, and the plantation of those districts by English settlers.

The consequences of this forward policy were twofold: (1) increased expenditure, which pressed heaviest on the colonists, or, as we may now call them, the gentry of the Pale; and (2) the rise of a bureaucratic form of government, consisting chiefly of English military officials. Increased taxation, and the feeling that they were gradually being excluded from their legitimate share in the management of the affairs of the country, led to an estrangement between the gentry of the Pale and the official representatives of government, which was construed by the latter as a sign of disloyalty and indicative of their intention to establish an independent or Irish interest. The feeling of estrangement was intensified by the fact that, whereas the English official class consisted of Protestants, the gentry of the Pale were to a man Roman Catholics. In the circumstances, then, it was only natural that the distinction which had

hitherto existed between the descendants of the first English settlers and the native Irish should have been lost sight of, and a tendency have manifested itself to lump both together as Recusants. And, indeed, so far as religion went, it could not be denied that the interests of the gentry of the Pale and those of the mere Irish were identical. The danger was that, by treating both as disloyal, the gentry of the Pale would in time be driven to make common cause with their old enemies, the mere Irish.

Such, in brief, was the situation at the end of Elizabeth's reign; and it had only altered for the worse when, in consequence of his quarrel with the Parliament and his unsuccessful efforts to impose his will on Scotland, Charles I was driven to adopt a policy of conciliation towards the Irish Catholics. In the summer of 1641 he announced his intention of yielding to the demand of the Irish Parliament for a revision of Poyning's Law, in the sense of restoring to Ireland her legislative independence, and of removing a number of administrative grievances. Unfortunately for the realisation of his intentions, the government of Ireland at the time rested in the hands of his political opponents; and, principally by the machinations of Sir William Parsons, the concession was not made before the rebellion broke out. It is an admitted fact that the gentry of the Pale had at first no share in the rebellion; and there is no lack of evidence to show that they were as much surprised by it as was the Irish Government itself. All the same, it is quite clear that, with the predisposition to believe them guilty, Government could not entirely trust their protestations of innocence. Too much was known or suspected of Charles's intrigues with them; and it would have been the height of folly for his political opponents not to have seized the opportunity to cross his designs. The gentry of the Pale might or might not be innocent of any share in the plot, but they were Catholics, and it was evidently as much to their interest as to that of the avowed rebels to prevent the Parliament getting the upper hand in England. The situation was none the worse because they had been forced into the open. Moreover—and this was the really reprehensible part of Parsons' argument—when the rebellion was suppressed,

as suppressed it no doubt would be in a short time, there would be large confiscations of some of the very best lands in Ireland available for plantation purposes. Finding themselves prejudged, the gentry of the Pale took the only path open to them and reluctantly decided to make common cause with the northern rebels. The result of the struggle was, as we know, the so-called Cromwellian Settlement. But there was a time when it seemed as if victory would crown the efforts of the Confederates. That this result, so ardently desired by the Irish, was not achieved was due almost entirely to the action of one man.

It requires, it must be admitted, considerable courage to write a life of James, Duke of Ormond, not merely on account of the enormous mass of documents that must necessarily be read and sifted by the conscientious student, but even more from the ever-present dread that, no matter how conscientiously the work is performed, the result is likely to prove unsatisfactory. Lady Burghclere has done her best to present us with a clear picture of the man and his times. But the subject is rather one for the historian than for the biographer. Ormond labours under the disadvantage of possessing no distinguishing features. He was neither a great general nor a great statesman, but simply an honourable man with a good fund of common sense, who owes his importance more to his position than to his abilities. Every age and every country can furnish men of his calibre by the score. Far from agreeing with Lady Burghclere that 'his sphere of usefulness would certainly have been circumscribed had he not belonged to the Established Church,' we hold that he was hampered all through his career by his religion. Had he been a Puritan, he, and not Parsons, would have been the ruler of Ireland's destinies, in which case the rebellion, if it had ever broken out, would have been promptly suppressed. If he had been a Catholic, he would have possessed greater liberty of individual action, and his position as head of the gentry of the Pale would have enabled him to reconcile the discordant interests of the Confederates. Being, however, as he was, that anomalous thing, an Irishman and an Anglican, he was as much an object of mistrust to the English faction as

he was to his own kinsmen and the gentry of the Pale. When the great crisis of his life came, and he was called upon to decide between handing Dublin over to Rinuccini or to the English Parliament, he adopted a course which, while it has earned him the eternal hatred of his countrymen, has scarcely been appreciated by Englishmen at its right value. Even Lady Burghelere, who seldom misses an opportunity to display his conduct in the most favourable light, rather qualifies the importance of his action on this occasion by making it more or less dependent on Charles's approbation; forgetting, as it seems to us, that no message from Charles could at the time be taken to express his real wishes, and that Ormond's offer to surrender had, long before he heard from Charles, been in the hands of the Parliament. Nothing indeed can alter the fact that the credit (or disgrace) of saving Ireland to England at this crisis belongs entirely to Ormond. With a firm hold of Dublin, the reconquest of the country by the Parliament was only a question of time. Dangan Hill, Rathmines, the coming of Cromwell, the capitulation of Limerick, mark the important stages in that reconquest. Then came the hour of retribution—the hour foretold by Sir William Parsons, when those great counties of the Pale would lie open to His Majesty's disposal and to a general settlement of peace and religion by introducing of English.

The history of the Irish Rebellion and its epilogue, the Cromwellian Settlement, is full of the strangest anomalies. The Rebellion, as is well known, began with a rising in Ulster for the recovery of their lands by the dispossessed Irish. According to current accounts, it had been attended by a bloody massacre of the Scottish and English Protestant settlers. The Anglo-Irish gentry of the Pale had been coerced by the force of circumstances and against their inclination into making common cause with the northern rebels. A settlement grounded in justice would, one might have thought, have taken account of these facts. The Cromwellian Settlement was based on the theory that whoever had at any time and in any circumstances not manifested a constant good affection to the Parliament of England was liable to punishment. The only question was the degree of guilt. And here it may be said that, except for those

few individuals who paid for their crimes with their heads, the sole test of guilt was the possession of property. Those who had nothing to lose lost nothing; those who had most to lose lost most. In the circumstances, the chief sufferers were the Anglo-Irish gentry of the Pale. The Cromwellian Settlement was based on their ruin; not, as is believed and so often asserted, on the ruin of the native Irish. The latter had long since ceased to possess anything worth taking. The test in the case of the Cromwellian forfeitures was not nationality but religion. It is this fact that gives significance to the struggle between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland from the Restoration down to the Revolution.

By the Cromwellian Settlement nearly the whole of the land of Ireland had passed into the hands of Protestants. When the Restoration came, the expropriated Catholic gentry naturally looked to Charles for the recovery of their estates. Unfortunately for the realisation of their hopes, Charles was bound to uphold the settlement recently arrived at. Even if the circumstances of his own restoration had allowed him a free hand in the matter, there was no going back on the fact that his father, however unwillingly, had consented to the original act of confiscation. That there would be some changes was generally admitted. The regicides would be dispossessed and the King's friends restored. But Charles's promise to leave the final adjustment to Parliament afforded a reasonable guarantee that nothing would be done to alter materially the *status quo*. In the course of the negotiations or rather intrigues that followed, three parties came into existence, viz. (1) the party represented by Lord Broghill, who wished to admit as small a change as possible in the existing arrangements; (2) the party represented by Col. Talbot, better known by his later title as the Duke of Tyrconnel, whose aim was to upset the settlement in favour of the dispossessed proprietors; and (3) the party represented by Ormond, whose desire was to effect a reasonable and lasting compromise between the contending interests of the two other parties. It is well known that the Act of Settlement, with its supplement the Act of Explanation, which became law in 1665, was practically Ormond's work; and from his point of view it was as fair a settlement as

could be reached. The concessions made by the Cromwellians to this end had been considerable; but they had been made reluctantly and did not go far enough to satisfy the demands of the dispossessed proprietors. The result was that Ormond was in disfavour with both sides.

It is unfortunate for a clear understanding of the course of events during the next twenty years (1665-1685) that our sources of information are in many important particulars extremely deficient. We know, for example, that Ormond was removed from office in 1669 by the intrigues of the Buckingham faction, assisted in Ireland by Lord Orrery. We may suppose that Orrery's motive was the desire to succeed to the lord-lieutenancy; and we may suspect that Charles was actuated by the desire to free himself from Ormond's tutelage. But we have no direct proof on either point. We know that Ormond's successor was Lord Robartes, a sour and sulky Puritan, but an advocate of religious toleration. We may presume that his appointment indicates Charles's intention of using him as the thin end of the wedge to break up the Protestant supremacy,* but it is only a presumption. Robartes' successor was Lord Berkeley of Stratton, ostensibly a Protestant but under the control of his Catholic wife. We know that his viceroyalty was marked by a recrudescence of ultramontaniam and a scarcely veiled attempt, under the pretext of a revision, to upset the Act of Settlement. We have grounds for believing that the moving spirit in this attempt was Talbot,† but we cannot tell how far Charles was his accomplice. We only know that, in consequence of the indignant protests of the Protestants, Berkeley had to be recalled. It may have been that in appointing Arthur Capel, Earl of Essex, a firm Churchman, in his place, Charles hoped to find in him a subservient instrument for the furtherance

* The favourable reception given to his appointment by the author of 'The Narrative of the Earl of Clarendon's Settlement and Sale of Ireland,' seems to warrant this conclusion. We notice that Lady Burghclere adopts Carte's hesitating conjecture that the author of this tract was Peter Talbot. But the author is generally admitted to have been Nicholas French, Bishop of Ferns.

† See particularly his plan for circumventing the Act of Settlement, found in his house in 1671, and printed in King's 'State of the Protestants,' App., p. 290.

of his Roman Catholic policy. If so, he was disappointed; and the reappointment of Ormond in 1677 may perhaps be regarded as an admission of failure on his part.

But it is proverbially an ill-wind that blows no one any good; and the Popish Plot, if it brought terror to every Catholic home in the three kingdoms, proved, when its hollowness was detected, a blessing in disguise for Charles. The revulsion in popular opinion, confirmed by the abortive Rye House Plot, afforded him the opportunity he had so long looked for, of freeing himself from the control of the Protestant party in Ireland. We know that his plan embraced the removal of Ormond, the separation of the military from the civil government, and a revision of titles to land. In the light of subsequent events we are entitled to conclude that Charles was being prompted by Talbot, though we have no direct evidence on the point. But with the accession of James II at this juncture we get on firmer ground. The mask, that fell from Charles when he lay a-dying, would not have fitted James even if he had had a mind to wear it. Prudence was not one of his characteristics; and, with Talbot (now Tyrconnel) at his elbow urging instant action, he displayed an all-too unseemly haste in ridding himself of the control of a minister, whose appointment had probably from the first been intended merely as a blind. With Clarendon's recall and the appointment of Tyrconnel as viceroy, James took the first step which was to lead, in his opinion, to the acquisition of absolute power.

The oft-told story of his great failure has recently been narrated in a temperate and scholarly-like fashion by Dr Murray in his 'Revolutionary Ireland.' Dr Murray clearly sees that, regarded from a European point of view, the war in Ireland was only an episode in the great struggle between Louis and William. The point has been sufficiently emphasised by Onno Klopp in his monumental work, 'Der Fall des Hauses Stuart im Zusammenhange der europäischen Angelegenheiten, 1660-1714.' But it is one that has been generally neglected by English writers; and Dr Murray is fully justified in recalling attention to it. But, if the war in Ireland has its European aspect, its chief interest for

students of Irish history lies in the fact that it was the last desperate effort on the part of the gentry of the Pale to reverse the Act of Settlement. Without Tyrconnel, as the acknowledged leader of that party, there would have been no war in Ireland at all; and to Tyrconnel it probably mattered little or nothing what became of James, if only he and his friends could recover the ground they had lost in 1641. But, to achieve that end, it was essential that James should be able to free himself from Protestant control; and that he could only do with the aid of Louis. To Louis, Ireland possessed merely a strategic value. Provided that, by supporting the revolutionary party, he could hold William long enough in check to beat him on the Continent, he was willing to open his purse widely; but for Tyrconnel and his schemes he had not the slightest interest. One thing he and Tyrconnel had in common—to both of them James was merely a tool. In this they differed from the English and Scottish Jacobites, to whom James was everything. When he was compelled to take refuge in Ireland, all their efforts were directed to preventing him doing anything which might alienate his friends in England and Scotland. They supported him in his resolution to press the siege of Derry in person, hoping that that city, when it was won, would prove a stepping-stone to Scotland, where he would be free from the malign influences of Tyrconnel and the French. When their hopes in this direction were disappointed, they strove to prevent him yielding to the pressure brought to bear on him to repeal the Act of Settlement. But their efforts were unavailing. Supported by d'Avaux, Tyrconnel was able, in James's own words, to ram that measure down his throat.

Dr Murray condemns the repeal of the Act of Settlement as unwise; and such no doubt it was. But men in Tyrconnel's position do not stop to consider such matters. It was the gambler's last throw. The stakes were enormous, and there was a chance of winning. Not to have taken it would have argued Tyrconnel to be a fool, which he certainly was not. That the attempt of the Anglo-Irish gentry to recover the properties of which they had been plundered was morally justifiable seems self-evident. Legally the 'rebels' were in a better

position than the 'loyalists.' For to urge, as Dr Murray does, that, because England had changed her sovereign, Ireland was *ipso facto* bound to acknowledge William, is merely to beg the question. The same argument, applied to Cromwell's usurpation, would prove Ormond to have been a rebel. The fact is that legal arguments are only valuable when they are backed by the sword. So far as the Anglo-Irish gentry were concerned, the question has been prejudiced by calling them Irish; and unfortunately there never has been a time when the name of Irishman has not been to Englishmen something like a red rag to a bull. We may, if we like to regard it from a European point of view, describe the war in Ireland as a struggle between Protestantism and Catholicism, or (better still) between constitutionalism and absolutism. But, from an Irish point of view, it was a struggle on the part of the Anglo-Irish colonists to recover their civil and religious liberties. How they came to lose these, we have tried to show. The passage we have quoted (p. 431) from 'The Beginnings of Ireland' reveals the first downward step in England's treatment of her kith and kin across the channel. From suspects they became traitors, recusants, rebels, Irish murderers, Papists, till at last no name was too bad for them. Looking back on the chequered history of the first English colony in Ireland, we cannot help regretting that religion was made the test of loyalty. Regrets are unavailing. It always seems to have been England's misfortune in her dealings with Ireland not to have allowed her that necessary degree of independence due to her situation, which, without imperilling the connexion, would have enabled Ireland to work out her own salvation. The Catholic gentry of the Pale were loyal till they were forced to be otherwise. The loyalty of Grattan's parliament was beyond dispute.

ROBERT DUNLOP.

Art. 8.—LLOYD'S AND INSURANCE. ✓

1. *History of Lloyd's and of Marine Insurance in Great Britain*. By Fred. Martin. London: Macmillan, 1876.
2. *Annals of Lloyd's Register*. (Privately printed), 1884.
3. *Lloyd's Calendar*, 1914. London: Lloyd's.
4. *'The Times' Shipping Number Book*. London: Printing House Square, 1913.

LLOYD'S would be interesting enough if it were only a centre for the dissemination of shipping news and the home of a large proportion of the marine insurance business of the country. But it is far more than that. Most foreign nations come to London, and so to Lloyd's, for some proportion of the necessary insurance on ships and goods, without which oversea trade could not be conducted; and it is safe to say that there are very few important events which are not immediately reflected at Lloyd's. Very often they are foreshadowed. The sinking of a great liner is a matter of the utmost moment to underwriters; so may be also the disappearance of a pearl necklace. Indeed, the theft of a necklace worth over 100,000*l.* is of far more importance, financially, than many of the shipwrecks that occur. The wreck of a German air-ship, a disaster in a Welsh coal mine involving, perhaps, claims for hundreds of thousands of pounds, an earthquake in the Indies, a typhoon in the China Seas, a great fire in Argentine meat-freezing works, the loss of a minute portion of radium, strikes and the fear of strikes, wars and the rumours of war, and the death of a Sovereign, are all events which find immediate reflection in the great insurance market.

The explanation is that the insurance habit is growing; and the progressive underwriter is perpetually considering how he can provide the indemnity against loss of capital which is needed by traders of all descriptions. Thus, the insurance of valuables during transit, either in the hands of commercial travellers or when sent on approval, has greatly facilitated dealings in jewellery; and precious musical instruments, such as violins and violoncellos, could hardly be acquired by many professionals if the risk of loss or damage could not be covered by insurance. Again, many persons undertake large enterprises the

success of which would be entirely ruined in the event of a General or Presidential Election or a heavy downpour of rain. The 'freak' insurances of which a good deal is heard are not mere gambling plunges; they rest on a legitimate basis—the encouragement of trade.

With the history of Lloyd's I do not now propose to deal in detail; it has been told and told ably by various authorities. It is with Lloyd's as it exists to-day—a great nerve centre of business—that I am mainly concerned. Its history seems to show plainly that Lloyd's has grown to greatness largely on its news. We know that the present institution is directly traceable to one Edward Lloyd, who established a coffee-house in Tower Street in the 17th century. It was here, and also no doubt in similar resorts, that sea-faring men congregated, and news in the form of letters was read to the assembled company or passed from hand to hand. In 1692 Lloyd moved to Lombard Street, and four years later he began to publish the news which he received in printed form as Lloyd's News. The career of this journal came to an abrupt end in 1697, owing to some rather forcible expressions of opinion respecting the House of Lords which Lloyd had printed. We are told that for nearly thirty years the frequenters of Lloyd's coffee-house had to rely on the original method of receiving the news; but in 1726 Lloyd's List was revived, and it has continued in that form until the present day. It claims to be, with the exception of the 'London Gazette,' the oldest newspaper in England. In 1774 the business transacted at Lloyd's premises was transferred to the Royal Exchange, which now houses the great insurance institution.

The collection and dissemination of news seem to have been steadily fostered by Lloyd's; and to-day the organisation is immense. There is scarcely a paper which does not rely for its information about the movements of vessels on Lloyd's. 'From Lloyd's' is a heading familiar to every newspaper reader. The information is derived from Lloyd's own signal-stations and its corps of agents throughout the world, and also through the steamship companies themselves. No doubt the principal papers could, if they chose, obtain much of the news direct from the companies, but they evidently find it simpler to rely upon Lloyd's.

Every day the arrivals and departures of many hundreds of ships at home and foreign ports are duly reported at the Royal Exchange. The reports are first of all entered in portfolios as they arrive; next they are printed and posted up in a recognised place on the walls; then they are sent to all interested subscribers, such as the Baltic and the Marine Insurance Companies; then they are printed every afternoon in Lloyd's List, which is published at 4 o'clock and circulates among shipping and insurance houses; and finally the more important of them, mainly those relating to ships carrying passengers, are sent to the London papers. This news is, in the first place, of interest to the friends of the crews and the passengers, for the human interest always takes precedence over that of business. Then it is obviously of importance to the owners and to the underwriters of the ship, next to the owners of the cargo, perhaps some hundreds of persons, and finally to the underwriters of the cargo. It is a common practice, for instance during the wool-season, for brokers to send their clerks pell-mell from Coleman Street to learn what ships from Australia have been spoken off the coast or have safely arrived in port, while paragraphs frequently appear in papers to the effect that the foreign wheat-market was weak owing to the large number of grain-ships which had arrived in the Channel.

These reports are sent from stations owned by Lloyd's, such as those at the Lizard and Brow Head, or from stations owned by the Admiralty and transmitted for Lloyd's, such as those at Beachy Head and Dungeness, or from other stations controlled by Trinity House, such as those at the Smalls and Tuskar. Use is often made of these stations by owners to send instructions to their captains. Probably ninety-nine out of every hundred nitrate ships which arrive off the Lizard do not know their ultimate destination. The cargoes may have been sold several times during the voyage. They may be destined for Hamburg in order that the nitrate may be used as a fertiliser for the great German beet-fields, or they may be intended for the big chemical and gunpowder works of Lancashire. It is true that a large number of these ships proceed to Falmouth, where they may make good some of the damage done in the battering they

generally get in rounding the Horn. But others receive their orders at the Lizard; and there is good reason to believe that some of the ships wrecked in the neighbourhood of that dangerous point struck on the rocks because they were venturing too close in order to signal. Still these are exceptional cases, and in no way affect the principle of this important function of the signal-stations.

In every signal-station a list may be found of ships for which the coastguards are requested to keep a sharp look-out, either in order that messages may be sent or because the vessels are overdue. During the daytime the signallers are usually able to identify the ships through their glasses; they may even be able to read the name, or they may identify the ship through her build or the colour and marking of the funnel. In such cases they would hoist the signal-letters of the ship, the vessel acknowledging by flying her answering pennant. The conversation is then opened, and it is closed by the exchange of recognised signals. Nowadays a good deal of this work is done by semaphores, in the use of which merchant seamen are becoming adept. If there is no particular reason for getting into touch with the ship, the signal-station waits until the vessel herself opens communication by hoisting her signal-letters, together with her national ensign. The news that she has passed such and such a point is immediately telegraphed to Lloyd's and there published in the manner already described. It not infrequently happens that merchant ships will communicate news relating to warships; and this information, especially in times of national stress, may be of interest to the Admiralty; thus a vessel crossing the North Sea may communicate to a British station what she has seen of the movements of German men-o'-war.

At night-time conversations are carried on in the Morse code by acetylene flash-lights capable of making themselves seen for a distance of eight or ten miles. The communication is then always started by the ship flashing her signal-letters. Uneasiness has sometimes been caused in the insurance market because a ship which had been accustomed to signal, say, when passing through the Straits of Gibraltar, had failed to do so. It was afterwards shown that there was dirty weather, and the ship's signals, even if made, had not been recognised.

In the meantime reinsurances may have been placed on the ship at comparatively high rates. As a matter of fact the reporting of passenger ships is in a transition stage at present, owing to the growing use of wireless telegraphy. Thus an Atlantic liner, crossing from New York, may inform the station at Inistrahull when she is perhaps 2000 miles away. But this system has its drawbacks. Only a few months ago there was a scare in London, Liverpool, and other ports, because a well-known liner, after signalling herself to that point at 8 o'clock one Friday morning, did not officially communicate until she reached Plymouth in the very early hours of the Saturday morning.

Agents are appointed for Lloyd's in practically every port of the world; and the position is one which is held in much honour by the local commercial men. The agent's function is to send immediate news of any casualties within his district, the information being couched in simple, though sometimes technical, language. It is of the first importance that the descriptions should accurately represent the case, because upon them underwriters often decide their course of action. Sometimes the reports may indicate that there are fair prospects of salvage if immediate steps are taken. Then the underwriters have to decide whether they shall arrange for salvage assistance to be sent. The case may be comparatively simple if the vessel happens to have gone ashore conveniently near a port where the best of appliances are available. It is a very different matter if she is stranded, for instance, on the north-west coast of Africa. The position may be exposed and the currents strong, and there may be no assistance nearer than Gibraltar, many miles distant. The salvage company, possibly a German or a Swedish institution, may require to have its expenses guaranteed before it will fit out an expedition; so the underwriters have to decide whether they will find the necessary sum on the chance of the salvage proving successful, or will content themselves with paying a total loss and having done with it. Underwriters have often paid far more than a total loss owing to expenses they incurred in arranging for expeditions. What actually happens nowadays is that the cases are left to the London Salvage Association,

a self-supporting institution with a very energetic secretary, a large staff, and a managing committee of insurance officials. This institution does excellent work on behalf of underwriters. One of its recent good cases was that of the 'Oceana,' sunk in the Channel on March 16, 1911, through collision with the German nitrate-laden ship 'Pisagua.' The news of the disaster was received in London on a Saturday morning when there were very few underwriters in the City. The Association, after hurried communication with the few who were available, immediately arranged with the Liverpool Salvage Association to despatch its famous salvage steamer 'Ranger' to the scene of the wreck. The result of her most successful operations was that gold and silver worth 768,126*l.* was salvaged out of metal worth 771,068*l.*, the salvage charges amounting to 35,265*l.*, or the extraordinary small proportion of 4.57 per cent. The whole of the gold was recovered and all the silver, with the exception of two bars. A curious feature of the case was the fact that, while the silver was lying at the bottom of the sea, the price of the metal rose in the London market, so that the underwriters secured a better price than that at which it had been shipped.

Apart from the importance of accurate news as a basis for future action, correct reports are desirable in the interests of reinsurance. As soon as a vessel gets ashore and the official reports are received, underwriters—known in the market as 'doctors'—who specialise in this business, begin to make a price. Nervous underwriters who have larger lines than they care for on the hull or cargo are glad to get rid of some or the whole of their liability by paying increased rates, which are supposed to represent the particular risks. There is room here for a little speculation. And then, of course, in the case of passenger boats, there is the question of the alarm caused to the friends of those on board. It is no detraction from the general value of newspaper reports to say that ordinary reporters, when describing shipping casualties, are often very much 'at sea.' The whole training of a newspaper man leads him to make his news as interesting as possible; and sometimes news can be made a good deal more attractive if there is a spice of exaggeration. Thus a story of a fire which

threatens to consume the whole of a ship may be made very interesting to the general public; a fire confined to one or two holds concerns but very few people. I have in mind the case of a fire in a new French liner, worth nearly 500,000*l.*, at Toulon last autumn. According to a report which was received through a news agency, the ship was almost completely destroyed. The hull was insured in the London market, but the great majority of the underwriters, instead of taking the account literally, waited for the official report, which showed that no serious damage had been done. The outbreak started in a refrigerating chamber and affected some part of the third-class accommodation. At first 40 per cent. was paid for reinsurance, but even before the reassuring report arrived the rate had dropped by half.

Yet even Lloyd's agents have not always been absolutely impeccable in this respect of accurate news. It will be remembered that last spring a message was cabled from Dakar to the effect that a boat had signalled that she had seen, a few miles distant, the wreck of what appeared to be a Union-Castle liner. For twenty-four hours great consternation prevailed; the offices of the company were bombarded by anxious inquirers; and the newspapers were full of the rumour. Wireless messages were sent to all vessels likely to be shortly in the neighbourhood to keep a sharp look-out and report. It was not until a day had elapsed that the Union-Castle Company was able to allay anxiety by pointing out that at that identical spot many years ago a Portuguese cruiser had been wrecked. This ship had two yellow funnels, and it was surmised that these appeared owing to the position of the sun to be red, the colour of the funnels in the Union-Castle fleet. The identity was definitely established when a British warship had been sent to investigate. Apart from the grave anxiety caused to friends of the passengers and crew, the mistake cost a considerable sum, while a great many thousands exchanged hands in the insurance market. Then again, last October, a very strange case was reported from the Pacific Coast of North America. Three different agencies contributed paragraphs to this tale. Harrowing descriptions were sent of the sinking of the ship, relieved by reports that all the passengers had been saved; but ultimately the

vessel arrived safely in port undamaged, and announced she had never met with an accident.

Another form in which Lloyd's provides news or information is in its Captain's Register. Here is to be found the record of every captain in the British Mercantile Marine. His different commands are shown, as well as any mishaps which may have occurred to his ships, and any censure which he may have incurred at Board of Trade Inquiries. Happily signal successes are recorded as well as mistakes, so that the fact that the Captain of the 'Snowdon Range' received Lloyd's medal for Meritorious Services last year is duly recorded against his name. But such entries, it must be confessed, are the exception and not the rule. For a captain to have had an eventful career too often means that he has had his share, or more than his share, of accidents. This system of recording incidents is naturally not altogether liked by the officers. It means that a captain who has once been held responsible for a serious mistake finds it extremely difficult to obtain a position of equivalent value again. It has occasionally happened that owners have expressed themselves as perfectly satisfied with their man and willing to employ him again, but for the fact that the underwriters would look up the record in the Captain's Register and charge the owners a higher rate of insurance.

At Lloyd's information respecting interesting small trade movements is often obtained, and may throw important light on political affairs. A few years ago, news that a large quantity of rifles was to be sent from Japan to the Red Sea enabled some idea to be gained of what was going on in that wild region. Again, there was news last year of a large consignment of war material from Austria to Roumania. In August 1911 an interesting side-light was thrown in the insurance market on the two mysterious ships 'Foam Queen' and 'Arizona.' It will be remembered that these two ships were seized by the Customs while being fitted out for a foreign expedition. The only real guide to their destination was the fact that insurances had been effected on the vessels and the war-material they contained, valued at 60,000*l.*, for the voyage to a South American port. Finally, under the Foreign Enlistment Act, the ships were forbidden by

the authorities to leave, and they were insured for their stay in port.

A great mass of vital information is compiled by Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping. This is the body which classifies ships and is responsible for the familiar phrase 'A1 at Lloyd's.' A great many years ago this body separated from the Corporation of Lloyd's, and is now quite a distinct institution, housed in magnificent premises in Lloyd's Avenue, Fenchurch Street.

The origin of Lloyd's Register Books appears to have been the 'Ships Lists' compiled by the frequenters of Lloyd's coffee-house. Obviously, from the early days of marine insurance, underwriters would have required records of the form of construction and age of the vessels they were asked to insure; and this information the hand-written 'Ships Lists' supplied. The oldest copy of a Register Book in existence bears the dates 1764-65-66, and is believed to have been published by a society which had ceased to exist before 1775. In 1760 an 'Underwriters' Register,' or Green Book, was established; and in 1799 shipowners produced a rival book known as the 'Shipowners' Register,' or Red Book. Both books continued to appear till 1834, when the rival registers were amalgamated under the title, now preserved, of 'Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping.'

To-day, together with the British Corporation (established in Glasgow) and similar bodies on the Continent, 'Lloyd's Register' watches over the construction of vessels and, by means of periodical surveys, endeavours to ensure that the equipment is maintained in first-class order. Detailed plans of new ships are first submitted to the local surveyors and are then examined by the officials in London, who make such comment as appears necessary. If the plans are approved, the building is begun; and thenceforward, until the completion of the ship, the work is carried on under the frequent survey of the local representatives. Finally, the Committee assigns a class to the ship, and the particulars appear in one of the two volumes of the Register. Steel castings, anchors and chains are all tested by the society's surveyors. Once every four years steel and iron ships and their engines are subject to special surveys; and it is required that all repairs due to accidents or wear

and tear must be made under the supervision of the surveyors, who are appointed at all the chief ports of the world. In addition to giving particulars of construction and machinery, the Register books now record names of vessels equipped with wireless telegraphy and submarine signalling installations, and of those fitted with refrigerating chambers, and the speed of fast merchant ships.

The Committee of Lloyd's Register, composed of seventy-two members, is now representative of the different interests concerned. It includes underwriters, shipowners, merchants, shipbuilders and engineers, appointed by the recognised societies in London, Liverpool, Glasgow and other great ports. There is also an advisory body of fifteen members, known as the Technical Committee, elected by the Institution of Naval Architects and the English and Scottish institutions of engineers, shipbuilders, and iron and steel masters.

Having tried to show how the organisation of news services has contributed to the greatness of Lloyd's, we may proceed to explain how all this information is utilised and where the business of insurance is carried on. Lloyd's now occupies the second floor of the Royal Exchange. In contrast to the grave solemnity of the great Hall of the Royal Exchange on the ground floor, the upper floors during business hours are the scene of intense activity. A few merchants meet at stated hours in the Hall of the Royal Exchange, surrounded by huge pictures illustrating important events in the history of the City of London. Upstairs the rooms are thronged from 9 o'clock in the morning until 5 o'clock in the evening with many hundreds of persons engaged in some form of maritime business. The entrance is modest. Passing under an archway with the simple heading of Lloyd's in gold letters, we ascend three flights of stone stairs, then pass through two sets of glass doors, and arrive at a barrier. Here sits a scarlet-robed janitor, to whom all but those who, as members, associates or subscribers, have a right to use the Rooms must state their business. If they want to see a member they must give the name, and the guardian of the door will be pleased to telephone to a functionary who stands elevated in a rostrum in a most conspicuous position in the Room. This individual,

with a carefully modulated voice, will call the name of the person required; and though, at any rate in the busy hours of the day, there is a hubbub and general buzz of talk, he usually manages to make himself heard. The underwriter called will perhaps send a clerk to the door to enquire who wants him, and, if he is satisfied with the answer, will probably tear himself away from the crowd and come to meet his friend in the lobby. Then the friend, properly escorted, may pass through the barrier. Turning sharply to the left, he finds himself in the underwriting rooms of Lloyd's. At right angles to the entrance is the great room where underwriters sit in boxes, dealing with the business as it is brought to them by the brokers. To the right of the entrance is another large room known as the Library, but now devoted to the latter.

In the corner of the Lobby is the little office of the Superintendent of the Room, a genial and able man who manages without any show of authority and without any friction to keep everything in order. At the side is the Rostrum, the stand of the scarlet-robed Crier. Over the Rostrum is the Lutine Bell salved from a French warship wrecked off the Dutch coast in 1799 while carrying a large amount of gold on board for payment of the troops then in the Netherlands. A comparatively small proportion of gold and various relics, such as cannon-balls and grape-shot, have already been salved; and operations to recover the remainder of the specie are at this moment being carried on by a British Company. This bell, as everybody must know by now, is rung when any important announcements, including notable 'arrivals,' are to be made. It was rung last year, when the 'Snowdon Range' reached port after her extraordinary passage of fifty days across the Atlantic. It was rung last September, to precede the announcement that the great pearl necklace, valued at 115,000*l.*, stolen while in transit from Paris to Hatton Garden, had been picked up in a Highbury street. It was rung again last June, when the Duke of Connaught, the Crown Prince of Sweden, and Prince Arthur of Connaught visited Lloyd's.

Opposite the Rostrum is the Casualty Book, in which all important casualties are entered. Until last

year it was known as the Loss Book; and only casualties were included which were supposed to be accidents of first-rate importance. Only vessels were entered in that book which had stranded, or been burnt, sunk, or abandoned; vessels which had stranded but had been refloated seriously damaged; vessels which had for any reason been condemned; and vessels which were reported to have been captured, seized, or detained. The scope of the book has now been much extended; and vessels to be entered in future are, in addition to the ships already mentioned, those which have cargo on fire; vessels in collision when the voyage is interrupted; vessels badly damaged through collision with ice or submerged dangers; and vessels whose voyages are interrupted by damage to or loss of mast and spars, by broken shafts or machinery disarranged, by having to put into port with heavy damage through stress of weather, or by colliding with dock walls. This extension of the scope of the book, as was pointed out in an article in the 'Times,' has been rendered desirable by the unceasing growth in the size of ships. Damage to a liner through collision with ice may be of much more importance to the market than the stranding, or burning, or sinking, or abandonment of some old cargo steamer. At the side of this book is an alcove, familiarly known as the Chamber of Horrors, in which all reports of casualties are published in detail. Here also is a stone tablet commemorating the services rendered by the 'Times' in the early part of the 19th century in unravelling a notorious fraud perpetrated upon the underwriting community.

The bulk of the business is brought to Lloyd's by brokers who have their representatives at different centres; the Marine Insurance Companies, of which there are some ten or a dozen in the immediate neighbourhood of the Royal Exchange, get their business, on the other hand, largely from their own agents at ports all over the world. At any rate, a large proportion of the cargo business is so received; the great majority of steamer insurances are transacted through the agencies of the brokers. Let us follow the method of procedure. A broker receives an order to insure, say, ten boats of values of between 30,000*l.* and 50,000*l.* apiece. That may

mean a total amount of about 400,000*l.* to be insured. He approaches a leading underwriter, either at Lloyd's or among the companies, and gets him to quote a rate. If the terms are satisfactory to the owner, the broker will get this underwriter to lead off with a certain amount. Perhaps this underwriter will write the sum of 3000*l.* on each boat; then the broker goes on to other underwriters and offers them the insurance at that rate. These men may either write similar or smaller amounts according to their judgment, fancy, or finance. If it is a big order, the broker may sometimes be hard pressed to complete it, and he may have to call in the aid of small men who will be prepared perhaps to write 100*l.* each. This, however, is the day of large syndicates, and in this connexion a great change has come over the market within the past ten years. Years ago many men wrote for themselves alone; nowadays it is customary for one man, known as the underwriting agent, to act for a syndicate of from three to a dozen 'names.' These 'names' have a position analogous to sleeping partners in private firms. They rarely visit Lloyd's, and no doubt, so long as they receive what they consider satisfactory interest on their capital, do not trouble themselves with the technicalities of the business. The underwriting agent may receive a certain fixed salary for acting for them, in addition; very often, to a percentage of the profits. In almost every case, too, he writes for himself.

The broker derives his profit from the commission paid by the company or underwriter accepting his business. In the event of loss he also charges a commission for collecting the claim from the underwriter. Indeed, a broker with a large connexion, if he confines himself to brokerage, has the prospect of earning a very satisfactory income without much risk. It is true that in a few recent bad years many of them have had to make good the shortcomings of underwriters. A cycle of exceptionally bad years, caused by heavy losses and premiums reduced by excessive competition, proved too much for certain underwriters; but few policy-holders hear of these events, since the brokers usually assume the responsibilities of the names they have accepted for their clients. It is doubtful, however, if they will ever

again be called upon to stand the racket, for power was taken by the Corporation of Lloyd's in its Act of 1910 to make good any deficiencies in the settlements of its underwriting members. Until the Act came into force the funds of the Corporation could not be so applied; and presumably they would not be so used again without absolute necessity.

Another important development of recent years has been a marked tendency towards co-ordination. It became clear five years ago that underwriters, in the desire to secure business, often cut each other's throats. Consequently in 1909 an Underwriters' Association was formed for the purpose of enabling members to come together to discuss questions of terms and principles. There has long been an Institute of London Underwriters, supported by practically all the Marine Insurance companies, which meets twice a week to consider important questions affecting all as they arise; and every autumn a large meeting is held to determine what shall be the general attitude towards the insurance of hulls for the coming year. In 1909 a general agreement was made between the Institute of London Underwriters and Lloyd's Association to advance rates, which undoubtedly had fallen very heavily during the preceding ten years. In the three following years there were also agreements. In 1912 the reason given for the advance in rates was the higher cost of ship-repairs, which were estimated to have risen by 15 per cent. during the year. Both the price of raw material and the cost of labour had risen. The first may be expected to fall when a decline in trade sets in, but there is no reason to anticipate a fall in wages; and the wage bill is an exceedingly important item in the cost of repairs. Underwriters also have to face the fact that the ship-repairing firms of this country, or nearly all of them, have an agreement among themselves and are able to impose practically any charges they like. Last autumn a further agreement among underwriters was formulated respecting rates. The object in deciding upon certain basic increases in rate was to discriminate between owners whose business had left satisfactory results to underwriters and those which had resulted in loss. The scheme proved to be too complicated, and it was never put into

effect. An entirely free market now prevails, and in theory underwriters can quote what rates they like.

While, as has been shown, news is the life-blood of insurance, a rigorous code of honour controls its circulation. It is, indeed, a principle of insurance that the contract is based on the assumption that full disclosure is made of all material facts. It has been held as unnecessary for one man to disclose to another facts which can be learned by both parties; thus it would not be incumbent on a broker to disclose to an underwriter the fact that a captain who was to be employed on a venture had previously met with disaster, for this would be at the service of the underwriter in the Captain's Register. But no underwriter would be justified in effecting a re-insurance on a ship if he had information disadvantageous to her which the other had not. He would have no right to make use of private information giving a worse impression of the casualty than was generally current in the market. Occasionally, of course, peculiar cases occur. Only the other Monday morning an underwriter, whom we will call Mr A., effected a reinsurance on a ship bound from the Baltic. In the afternoon Mr B., who had accepted the reinsurance, sent his compliments to Mr A., and knew he was above suspicion; but he thought Mr A. would be interested to learn that, according to a Danish newspaper, the ship had gone ashore on the previous Saturday. This, naturally, was news to Mr A.; he had reinsured in good faith; he saw no reason to release Mr B. from the bargain; and there the incident ended. This incident, in fact, explains the meaning of the words 'Lost or not lost' on every marine insurance policy. The words mean that the insurance comes into effect if the vessel is either safe or actually wrecked at the time when the business is accepted, provided that the principal has no reason to believe that the vessel has met with an accident.

Individual judgment has always played, and seems likely to continue to play, an extremely important part in successful underwriting. Marine underwriting is always presenting new sides, and it will be years before a man can be expected to master all the details. He will have, as a preliminary, to make a close study of geography. Then he will have to familiarise himself with the different types of ships and the risks peculiar

to their trades. First, there are the mail and passenger-liner companies; some are better managed than others. Then there are the liners which mainly carry cargo but accommodate some passengers as well. In some of the trades in which these boats are employed the risk of fire may be specially prominent. There was, unfortunately, at one time a long series of disasters to vessels in the Australasian trade, partly because they bring home huge quantities of wool, with which there may be a risk, especially if, as sometimes happens, there is heavy rain just before it is put on board, and perhaps partly because of the amount of insulation surrounding the refrigerating chambers for the carriage of the frozen meat. Thirdly, there are the so-called 'tramps,' which are sent anywhere to earn the best freights they can get. Experience has enabled underwriters to hedge the insurance of these boats about with certain restrictions. There are certain clauses and warranties designed to rule out undesired contingencies. Thus, unless specially arranged, steamers are not allowed to trade with British North America except through certain ports; they are not allowed to sail up the Baltic above a certain latitude during the winter months; they are not allowed to carry Indian coal in the summer, nor at any time to visit the extreme north of Europe or Asia. But even with these warranties inserted a good deal of latitude is left to owners; and the underwriters have to decide which trades are likely to result in profit or loss. Only a comparatively few large sailing ships remain, for there are now practically but three trades open to them. These are the wheat trade from Australia, the nitrate trade from the Pacific coast of South America, and the wheat and tinned fruit and salmon trades from the Pacific coast of North America.

Apart from steamers and sailing ships, there is a multitude of other risks. First of all there is the construction risk on warships building in private yards for home and foreign governments, the cost of which seems ever to increase. Then there are the building risks on mercantile vessels, the towing of enormous floating docks from one home-port to another or across the oceans, the towing of cranes, caissons, obsolete warships, and dredgers, and the conveying of the large number of small craft which are built in this country to be sent abroad. The

conditions in which unwieldy or small craft are to be sent across the seas have to be specially considered. Thus it is common to see a warranty that a tug shall not leave this country for the United States or Canada later than Sept. 15, or that a small passenger steamer shall not leave at such a time as would involve her crossing the Indian Ocean when the monsoons are blowing.

Similarly, underwriters on cargo have to consider all sorts of conditions. The risk of transporting a consignment of rubber from a point many hundreds of miles up the Amazon to London is quite different from the risks attaching to cotton from the time that it is put into the presses in the Southern States of North America until it arrives at a warehouse in Tokio. Underwriters have to form their own standards of safety, which are not always those of the public. There are men, for instance, who are quite content to have thousands of pounds on a cargo of hides being brought from South America to Germany in little ships of about 100 tons. Their statistics may show that the loss ratio on such ships over a long series of years has been very small—far below that of steamers fifty times their size. It is worth noting that the risk of total loss is usually held to be far less serious from the underwriting point of view than that of damage to the ship or cargo through some minor accident. Small claims for these are occurring every day, of which very little is heard by the public.

The management of Lloyd's rests ultimately with a committee of twelve elected by the members. They are elected for a period of four years, three retiring every year. The chairman is elected annually by the committee. For many years it was customary to elect as chairman some prominent man not necessarily connected with insurance to act as a figure-head, with a vice-chairman elected from the committee. The late Lord Goschen and Lord Revelstoke acted in this way. Since 1902 the chairman has been elected from the committee, and as a rule serves only for one year. This rule was broken at the end of 1908 when Sir John Luscombe was elected for another year of office, the reappointment being due partly to Sir John's popularity and partly, no doubt, to the fact that Lloyd's was then in the throes of

introducing the novelty of an annual audit. In 1910 Sir Raymond Beck was elected chairman, and again elected at the end of the year for a second year of office. For 1912 and 1914 Sir John Luscombe was elected. In 1913 Sir Edward Beauchamp, M.P., held the office.

Much of the administrative work rests with the secretary, who has under him a large staff. Col. Sir Henry Hozier for many years held this office and served Lloyd's well. The present holder is Rear-Admiral Inglefield. The whole of the shipping intelligence organisation is controlled by the committee and the officials, but the Corporation merely watches the transaction of marine insurance business. Many people suppose that the Corporation itself transacts marine insurance, as is shown by the large number of enquiries and even orders sent to the secretary. All that he can do is to pass them on to a firm of brokers.

The financial demands made upon underwriting members have been very much steepened of recent years. The arrangements now in force are as follows. Underwriting members have to pay an entrance fee of 400*l.*, or in certain cases 200*l.* The annual subscription is twenty guineas. If the underwriter intends to transact marine insurance, he must deposit with the Committee a sum of at least 5000*l.* to be held in trust by them. Each year he will have to produce an auditor's certificate that he has sufficient funds invested to close the account, and that all the premiums he receives are invested and held in trust for the account. Where there has been weakness in the past, the mischief has sometimes been attributed to loose investment or even speculation with the premium income. The requirements from underwriters transacting non-marine business are on a different basis. The underwriter must show that he has a fund available at least equal to the premium income of the preceding year. This fund may be partly in cash and partly in the form of guarantees in a form and of such a nature as meet with the requirements of the Board of Trade. He must also show, like the marine underwriter, that all the premiums are invested in a trust fund and that there is sufficient to close the account. There are some 650 underwriting members;

and it is stated in Lloyd's Calendar that the sum invested by the Committee exceeds 7,000,000*l*.

The extension of non-marine business at Lloyd's has lately been a remarkable feature. The amount of fire premiums received annually must run into millions of pounds, and it seems to be growing. In the foreign field Lloyd's members work in association with the British Tariff Companies, while the large market for reinsurance at Lloyd's has tended to support the non-Tariff Companies, who otherwise would have found their facilities strictly curtailed. Lloyd's underwriters are not altogether loved by the Tariff Offices. They are able to work cheaper and no doubt have attracted a good deal of business away. In the past they have often made use of the spadework done by the offices and have been content to follow their lead. Yet much of their success has certainly been earned quite legitimately. They have proved themselves more adaptable. They have always been willing to transact insurance of loss of profits, and they have introduced a system, which has proved popular among merchant houses, of insuring only the excess of a certain amount, leaving the client himself to bear, say, the first 25*l*. or 50*l*. of any claim. For such terms they accept a lower premium, but this is balanced by the saving of trouble in not having to pay a large number of trivial claims which the merchant can quite well afford to pay himself. Then there is an immense amount of workmen's compensation business and now also a great deal of motor-car insurance. One at least of the associations which specialises in this business has its agents for effecting repairs in almost every important town in the United Kingdom. The volume of jewellery insurance is steadily growing, both on stones during exhibition and in transit. Policies are issued covering buildings in dangerous areas against the risk of earthquakes; and there is a large business in insuring Indian tea-crops against the risk of hail. The usual practice is to cover the crops up to 50 per cent. of the whole value. Lastly, besides fidelity guarantee business, there are many other smaller types of which I shall give a few examples later.

It is hardly necessary at this time of day to go in detail into the wording of the ordinary policies. The old phraseology of centuries ago is still preserved; in

fact the meaning of almost every word has at some time or other been thrashed out in the Law Courts, and no doubt it would be dangerous to alter the language. Two points have come into great prominence during the past few years, namely, the attitude of the insurance markets towards war and strikes.

By the old wording of the marine insurance policy the risk of war is covered; and the general practice is now, paradoxically, to insert a clause ruling out this very contingency. This is known as the 'free of capture and seizure clause.' In normal times underwriters are usually ready to strike out this clause for a consideration; but it happens that, when owners get alarmed, there is generally good reason for charging a comparatively high rate. In the summer and autumn of the year 1911 there was a great rush for war insurance; and even owners of well-known liners making pleasure cruises to northern capitals were glad to pay comparatively high premiums for cover. The marine insurance companies generally exclude the risk of war from all annual contracts covering cargo; underwriters at Lloyd's often include it, subject to the option of exclusion on 15 days' notice. Such notice was given two years ago. But in any event a first-class war would have the worst possible effect upon the insurance market. Lord Haldane has said that, if war comes, it will come as a thief in the night; and it can be imagined that within a few days irreparable damage might be done. On a very small scale, the experience of underwriters during the Russo-Japanese war was an illustration of how they would be affected by a first-class war in Europe. A great many ships were sent from this country to Vladivostock with coal, and were insured at high premiums, say 25 or 30 per cent. So long as the Japanese warships were engaged at Port Arthur all went well, but when these were released they were able to keep a sharp look-out for ships attempting to reach Vladivostock and caught a large number, representing an estimated loss of about two millions to underwriters who had been tempted by the high rates to insure the boats. No doubt some of the owners heard of the capture of their ships without much sorrow. The question of what would happen to insurances on enemy goods is one that is always rising to the surface. Last June at an

International Conference at Copenhagen Sir Edward Beauchamp stated that, whatever might be the law on the subject, underwriters would certainly pay. There is much to be said for this declaration, if only because trade now is international, and a cargo may change its nationality two or three times during a long voyage.

During the Balkan war there was a good deal of business transacted, which took all sorts of shapes. Apart from ordinary insurances on ships and cargo, there were policies effected to pay so much a day if vessels were detained owing to the closing of the Dardanelles. Policies were taken out to cover the risk of damage to oil wells in Galicia in the event, presumably, of an invasion by Russian troops. And, as a corollary to all the forms of war insurance, there were policies taken out to cover the risk of the conclusion of peace. Early in December 1912, 50 per cent. was quoted to secure the payment of a total loss should peace not be declared between Greece and Turkey before the end of that year. When international relations were strained, large numbers of Danes took fright, and an immense amount of property was insured at Copenhagen for a year at premiums of from 2s. 6d. to 4s. 6d. per cent. Portugal with its alarms of Royalist risings has sent a great deal of business to London. From a somewhat similar cause, Ireland has recently developed a special line of business. Since August 1912, mills and other commercial property in Ulster have been insured against damage through civil commotion caused by the Home Rule Bill. Some of these insurances came into force on January 1, 1913; others, in view of the possibility of disturbances last year, only took effect in December. In Mexico many insurances were granted by underwriters, until they began to think the risks too great and tired of the business.

An interesting development last year was the formation of two societies for the mutual insurance of ships against war risks. The first was formed under the auspices of a Mutual Club with a large membership of cargo-steamship owners; the second was a combination of many of the great liner companies.

We may now turn to the risks from strikes. Two years ago, when strikes were looming unusually large, a new clause was inserted in cargo insurances excluding

the risk of loss or damage caused by strikers, locked-out workmen, or persons taking part in labour disturbances or riots or civil commotions. For a consideration, underwriters are prepared specifically to cover the risks of direct damage, but only of direct damage. They would include the risk of the loss of cargo thrown overboard by strikers, but, unless specially arranged for, they would not cover the loss of meat owing to the breakdown of refrigerating machinery caused by the lack of coal. The lack of coal would be held to be the direct cause, and the strike which brought that about the indirect cause. Similarly they would not cover loss of market. A proposal was put forward last year by shipowners that the risk of expenses occurring in connexion with strikes should be met by general average contributions, a question around which there has been much controversy.

Amid much that is serious in connexion with strike insurance there are occasionally lighter touches. There is the case of the persistent gentleman, a resident at Southend, who, when railway strikes were threatened, was prepared to pay a premium to insure receipt of a certain sum should there be no train to convey him to London. In return for a premium of thirty shillings, underwriters agreed to pay him one pound for every day during the succeeding month if there was no train available. There was also the instance of the gentleman who took his family to Margate when the great railway strike had opened, and provided that there should be a nice little sum due should he and his family have to stay there because of the lack of railway facilities or to pay for other methods of transport. Though the matter was not at all amusing, a good deal was heard of the ten cows which, at the time of the coal strike, were insured for a year against damage by strikers. Strikes abroad have also brought much business to the market. The amount effected on South African mines during the strike of last year ran into huge figures; mining property of all descriptions around Johannesburg was covered, and buildings in the town were insured. It is on record that some underwriters, prudently as they thought, refused to touch the mining property, but readily insured commercial buildings in Johannesburg. By a stroke of ill-luck for these cautious men, the only

real damage done was the firing of a leading newspaper office there, on which a loss of 10,000*l.* had to be paid.

Of these abnormal forms of insurance the least successful has been the holiday rain scheme. 'Pluvius' policies were much talked of during 1911 and 1912, but the principle was faulty. There is a perfectly legitimate field for insurance against rain in connexion with cricket matches, flower shows, bazaars and other forms of entertainment where expenses have to be incurred, and, owing to bad weather, may far exceed the receipts. It is quite usual for policies to be taken out for leading matches at Lords and aviation meetings at home and in the United States, but it is a different matter with holidays. A man is not going to be bothered to pay a substantial premium in order to receive two or three pounds if there happen to be two or three wet days. And the amount of disappointment is not to be measured by the amount of rain in a gauge. Underwriters have so far been rather shy of aviation risks. Some of the aviation schools, though, cover their pupils against the risks of accidents while they are learning to fly. For a premium of 10*l.* per pupil they can insure the sum of 5*l.* per week during disablement not exceeding twenty-six weeks, and 1*l.* per week during partial disablement. The risk of fatality is not accepted. Underwriters declare that the risk on pupils is far better than that on fully-fledged aviators, because the latter take much bigger risks.

Insurances of race-horses are common and may easily amount to 30,000*l.* on one animal. The market had a lucky escape when Tracery was pulled down at Ascot last summer by a militant suffragist but escaped unhurt, for the horse was insured on a high value. Lately a very large amount of insurance has been placed on The Tetrarch, the favourite for the Derby. The insurances are to provide for a total loss, should the horse for any reason be unable to go to the starting-post. They were effected by ardent supporters of the horse, who argue that nothing but a breakdown before the event can prevent him from winning. These insurances are effected in much the same spirit as one last year to pay a loss should any member of the Cambridge Eight fall ill before the race with Oxford. The insurer felt certain that, barring an accident to a member of the crew,

Cambridge must win—a confidence which was falsified after a fine race.

Shortly before the coronation of King George V a great deal of insurance was effected by persons occupying houses on the route which the procession was to take. If it passed their doors, they stood to receive big sums for seats. The insurances were either to provide against the postponement of the event or any change of route. Ten per cent. was at one time paid. As every General Election draws near there are all sorts of insurances taken out. For some persons an election means good trade, for others bad business. Some of these political insurances are of a somewhat speculative nature. Thus on the first day of the last election the rate covering the risk of a Unionist majority fell from 20 to 5 per cent. A premium of 30 per cent. was paid if the Coalition had a majority of 130. In the autumn of 1912 five per cent. was paid to insure the payment of a total loss should Mr Lloyd George be made Prime Minister before the end of the year. But one of the strangest enquiries that ever reached the market was from an undertaker in the East End of London. He desired to cover the risk of shock caused to persons by his coffins being delivered at the wrong houses at night. Underwriters expressed themselves willing to quote a rate if particulars were given of the turnover, the number of shocks caused, and their effects.

In this article there has been no attempt to enter into the technicalities of marine insurance business, to deal with its law, or to touch upon many subjects bearing on it, such as the frauds which various persons have endeavoured to perpetrate upon the underwriting community. Rather the idea has been to give, within the space available, a general impression of the services rendered to commerce by the underwriting community and of the life led by underwriters and brokers. For those who are attracted by maritime matters, or who take a keen interest in almost any form of enterprise, the life undoubtedly has its charms.

CUTHBERT MAUGHAN.

Art. 9.—INDIAN FINANCE AND CURRENCY.

1. *The Royal Commission on Indian Finance and Currency.* Seven vols. London : Wyman, 1913-14.
2. *An Act to provide for the Establishment of Federal Reserve Banks to furnish an Elastic Currency, etc.* [United States] : Public, No. 43-63d, Congress.
3. *On Chinese Currency.* By Dr G. Vissering. Two vols. Amsterdam : J. H. De Bussy, 1912-14.
4. *Annual Report of the President of the Java Bank,* 1912.

SINCE the mints of India were closed to the free coinage of silver in 1893 on the advice of Sir David Barbour, the currency policy to be pursued has thrice passed under review. But the composition of the reviewing bodies which succeeded the Herschell Committee has not been entirely satisfactory. The reference to the Fowler Committee was intended as an appeal from the theoretical to the practical—from experts to men of the business world or, to borrow a legal phrase, from a special to a common jury. And the result has been somewhat to darken wisdom, for both elements should be present in the tribunal. The appointment of Mr Chamberlain's commission has been due to quite other causes. Recent purchases of silver through Messrs Montagu instead of through the customary agency of the Bank of England had excited considerable feeling, while party attacks had been made in Parliament regarding the enormous Indian balances lent out at interest in the London money market, and there had been general criticism both in India and England of the currency policy pursued.

In these circumstances the Government, instead of appointing a select committee of economists and bankers, has, not unnaturally, had recourse to the customary expedient of a whitewashing Royal Commission. The only economist on this body was a young gentleman formerly in the India Office, who had already committed himself deeply to very definite views upon the matters coming up for adjudication, and had recently written a book whose every page bears evidence of a still intimate connexion with the office to which he lately belonged. On the other hand, the choice of a chairman

was exceedingly happy—we might even say astute. The temper and tact with which the discussion has been guided, and the breadth and sense of balance animating the report are alike admirable, while every breath of political feeling has been rigorously excluded.

The Commission sum up the result of their deliberations in no less than forty-one conclusions, all of which it is neither possible nor profitable to examine within these pages. I propose to confine my observations to the more important of these conclusions, and to discuss them under three main heads—(1) the currency policy to be pursued, (2) the management of Government balances, and (3) the desirability or otherwise of a Central Bank.

Judgment is pronounced against a gold currency. In paragraphs 56 *et seq.* the arguments advanced in its favour are summarised and dismissed, and the conclusion reached is that the people of India neither desire nor need gold for circulation, and it is not to India's advantage to encourage its use. Yet it is stated that a gold unit is unobjectionable if genuinely demanded by Indian sentiment, and that the Government should contrive to give the people whatever they demand, rupees, notes or gold. Directly this last admission is made, there is really little left to quarrel about. Many of us believe, contrary to the opinion above expressed, that India desires a gold currency, and will continue to show this desire by importing and using gold as currency in large and increasing quantities. *Solvitur ambulando.* We are therefore content, so long as no obstacle is placed in the way of India getting the currency she desires. No one wishes to force gold on India or believes that the attempt would do anything but defeat itself, and every one would be glad to see her use more paper.

It is, however, impossible to pass over without criticism the very perfunctory examination of the arguments on either side made in the paragraphs cited above. The argument, that India should be encouraged to use gold to protect the world (and itself) from a further rise in prices due to cheapening gold, is (not altogether without reason) classed with the opposite argument that India by using gold adds to the inconvenient drain of gold to the East, and dismissed with the remark that neither consideration should be permitted to affect India's policy.

This treatment is hardly fair to those who have advanced the former argument. No one could say whether the old spectre of the gold drain would not affect the Commission's nerves. It was resuscitated by at least one witness (Mr Barrow), though it should have been laid finally to rest by Lord Rothschild, who pointed out (to the Fowler Committee, I think) that what England did not absorb others took. In other words, London was the neck of a bottle through which the world's supplies were poured, and what it could not retain went to others; why not, then, to India amongst them?

The Commission urge that India's interests should alone be considered. But it is perfectly legitimate to add, as I did, that if you bring in the question of England's advantage, it not only would not lose by India's adoption of a gold currency, but would gain, with India and the rest of the world.

I now propose to examine *seriatim* the remaining criticisms offered by the Commission on the policy of a gold currency in the order in which they are marshalled. No one denies that India, being a poor country where the unit of transactions is low, will, for an indefinite period, require large quantities of silver for its everyday payments; but there are also large payments to be made, e.g. rent, purchase of cattle, interest on moneylenders' advances, marriage and funeral expenses, and legal charges (a lawsuit is one of the first luxuries and amusements that a prosperous peasant indulges in). In such transactions it is not only more economical to use gold, but gold is, as a matter of fact, replacing silver. Savings are best preserved in small bulk; travelling monies are safest when carried unobtrusively; while part of the purchase money for produce sold wholesale is conveniently receivable in some units of high value, as they will be useful for the foregoing purposes.

By all means let the people use notes if they will, and give all facilities that are not costly to encourage their use. Yet it still remains true that gold is more convenient and portable than rupees. The cause of progress is not advanced by refusing to look facts in the face. No one holds that the use of gold is a *necessary* step towards an ideal currency, viz. paper backed by

gold. What has been said is that, as the unit of transactions rises, there is a natural tendency to employ a currency unit of higher value. This is what is happening in India and has happened in Europe. Down to 1870 everything was obscured in Europe by the action of the bimetallic tie. Thereafter the natural movement towards the higher unit of value became very marked in Germany, Russia, Austria and France, and has resulted in a very large coinage of gold.

The argument quoted in sub-section iii is a mere travesty of the point urged, namely, that when Europe is adhering with great tenacity to the preservation of gold currencies, or, in the alternative, to paper currencies so strongly secured by gold as to resemble gold certificates, it is undesirable to press the advantage of a silver token currency upon the incredulous East. Much has been heard of late of the advantages obtainable from the Insurance Act of ninepence given for fourpence. The pressing upon reluctant India of a rupee which costs tenpence to produce, but is offered at sixteenpence, is a proceeding which is even more likely to excite suspicion.

The fourth argument, that gold in circulation is a support to exchange, requires, as the Commission declares, careful examination. Yet there is perhaps no passage in the whole report so open to adverse comment as their observations on this subject. Reference is made to the policy of the Bank of England and the Reichsbank; and it is averred (but no evidence is adduced of the fact) that Germany is doing what Goschen desired to do, that is to say, is replacing its gold in circulation by notes and keeping the gold so obtained in reserve. Granting all this, the real point is missed. The currency policy of England and Germany (and France) is primarily directed to securing its gold basis, a vast superstructure of credit depending on a slender foundation which it is desired to strengthen. Goschen, when advocating the substitution of small notes for gold, proposed to hold 80 per cent. of the circulation in gold; and his idea was that, this gold being in excess of what was really required behind the notes, a portion of it could be utilised in times of crisis. That is to say, when there is grave monetary

stringency, gold in reserve is better than gold in circulation, for it not only has its own value, but it may serve as the basis of further credits.

England and France (and probably Germany, but the point is disputed) are creditor countries, so the question of preserving gold to meet foreign indebtedness does not arise. Such countries have only to watch that other countries owing money do not, in order to pay their own debts, inconvenience them by sudden withdrawals. They require their gold primarily to secure their own monetary systems. India, though a debtor country, has a favourable balance of trade. Normally, therefore, India, like England and France, wants enough gold to secure her own currency and admit of its expansion in times of need. Unlike England and France, she must also hold enough to liquidate an adverse balance on the rare occasions on which it may arise. Nobody suggests that under present conditions of civilisation an adverse balance is liquidated primarily out of the pockets of the people. If it cannot be met by long-dated drafts or by the sale of securities, gold goes from the Banks. If they have not enough, they raise the rate of discount and so check borrowing, and existing loans mature. Gold is thus forced in from the circulation and becomes available. If there is still a gap, the process goes on until prices fall. When this happens, people who kept 5*l.* in their pockets only require to keep 4*l.*, and so on.

The argument that in 1907 the gold in circulation in India was not used for export is really comic, for it is admitted that the Government refused to part with it for that purpose. It is also incorrect to argue that the gold which went out did not mitigate the situation. When the people are not convinced that the Government intends, *coûte que coûte*, to redeem the token rupee, the most certain way of restoring confidence is to redeem it on the spot without inquisitorial enquiry. If gold had not been given out, those who were refused the supply might have asked for the same amount of reverse council drafts,* and the refusal to give out freely such gold as was locally available might have increased the demand. Moreover, the gold taken from the currency for the internal

* Drafts drawn by India on London.

demand relieved the pressure by taking the place of gold which would otherwise have been imported.

The Commissioners admit that in Egypt, where gold is the marginal currency of the country, gold from the circulation is available for export at times of depressed trade; but they deny that, if gold formed 20 per cent. of the Indian circulation, it would be similarly available. In the face of the first admission, which was inevitable—for Egypt's practice is well known—the special pleading employed with respect to India need not delay us.

Lastly, before leaving this aspect of the question, it is not possible to let pass unchallenged the idea that the security of the gold standard is impaired by future additions to Indian currency being made in gold rather than in token rupees. It is argued in all seriousness that to the extent sovereigns are imported for the circulation instead of silver rupees the reserve is weakened. A little reflection will show the fallacy of such an argument. If a rupee is issued at 16*d.* and the resultant profit which accrues, owing to its contents being purchased by Government at 10*d.*, is placed to reserve, we are as safe as but no safer than if a sovereign had been issued, for each is fully covered.

Let us assume that the currency is composed of gold to the extent of 20 per cent., and of token rupees to the extent of 80 per cent.; the suggestion is that, as the proportions change and the gold plays a larger part in the circulation, the safety of the gold standard is progressively impaired. This is arrant nonsense. What is really meant is that, if you use silver tokens instead of gold, you may arrive at a point where you could theoretically, by gaining interest on your reserves, arrive at a fund greater than 100 per cent. In other words, a token, if efficient, is more economical * than a full value coin. But I am not aware that anyone has ever denied this.

* The case for the economy obtained by the use of a token rupee instead of a sovereign is easily overstated. The immediate profit is the difference between ten and sixteen annas, viz. six-sixteenths. Of this something has to be held in liquid gold not earning interest. Let us assume that three-sixteenths can be invested in securities earning 3½ per cent. As against this we have the expense of handling and shipping silver as compared with gold, the cost of minting fifteen rupees as compared with a sovereign, the greater rate of wear of silver, the grave economic loss involved in the use of coins heavy to transport and bulky to store, and the evil of high prices

I now pass to the two remaining arguments said to be adduced by advocates of a gold currency—that the constant mintage of rupees is objectionable, and that the present system is mismanaged and artificial.

Here the boot is on the other leg. Many of those who advocate a larger use of gold are unjust to the merits of the present system. Silver is, and must remain, a very large part of India's currency. It is only coined in response to public demand, and for every 15 rupees taken the equivalent in gold is received. Some years ago an inclination to prevent the flow of gold to India existed, and council drafts were sold at rates which discouraged its export. With this exception* the system has been, and is, automatic. Recently gold has gone to India in quantities that are almost in excess of its immediate effective employment. There is little doubt that India will go its own way and adopt the form of currency it desires. That form, in my belief, will be an increase in gold such that the token coinage will eventually cease to be a practical danger. For this reason these pronouncements of the Commission, and any criticisms upon them, have little practical importance.

Far from having a bias against a paper currency based upon gold, Mr Conant and myself, when requested (in 1912) to advise in Nicaragua, and finding inconvertible paper to be the ordinary currency, recommended that nothing should be done to disturb the habit of using so economical a medium of circulation. The system of arbitrary emission of paper was, of course, stopped; and, as the issues were in grotesque excess, we advised the redemption of a number of notes sufficient to bring the quantity to a reasonable figure, and the provision in New York of sufficient gold (which was in the first case borrowed on the security of the Customs revenue)

caused by economising gold when there are signs of its unhealthy abundance. The balance of advantage is not so certain as is generally thought.

* The exception is a matter of grave importance. So long as the system of council drafts is used for currency purposes, it is obvious that the question whether gold or silver goes to India depends upon which is the cheaper form of remittance. It is within the power of the India Office to turn on either tap by manipulating the rate at which council drafts are sold. To this extent the present system is not automatic. If the pronouncement of the Commission, that India is to have what it wants at the par of sixteen pence, is faithfully observed in the spirit as well as the letter, the point is not vital.

to meet an adverse drain. Future currency was to be issued on the tender of gold, in the form of paper or silver as the tenderer might desire; or, if he preferred it, he could import and circulate a full value gold coin. We believed and still believe that, if paper is the best medium for Nicaragua, it will be used; and this cause is promoted rather than defeated by allowing the people to do as they please.

Again, it is interesting to notice what is occurring in Java, which is the cradle of exchange-standard systems. Dr Vissering, whose authority will not be called in question, writes as follows :*

'Whereas a short time ago only a couple of million guilders in gold were kept in the vaults of the banks of Netherlands India, and none whatever was found in circulation, the banks may now be estimated to hold at least 38 millions of gold, while renewed attempts have been made to make gold coins a popular form of currency. It is too early to say if these attempts will now be successful; but, whatever may be the result, it is certain that within a period of little more than one year the monetary situation has become entirely different, in this sense, that the silver token coins are now to a large extent protected by a supply of gold lying in the country itself, with the additional effect that eventual balances of payment against Netherlands India could now largely be settled in gold. By this sudden change the foreign reserves have become much less essential to the maintenance of the token coins; and it could even be contended that Netherlands India no longer rests upon a gold exchange basis, but has passed to a pure adoption of the limping standard.† If this contention is right—and we think there is much to be said in its favour—then this transition has been so smooth and gradual that no outward sign of that important change has been visible in every-day life to any member of the community, though the international monetary position of Netherlands India has thereby been considerably strengthened.

'If this is the right way to look at the change which has taken place in Netherlands India, it gives a striking proof of the elasticity of the gold exchange system, and of the various manners in which it can be applied, while the change from

* 'Chinese Currency,' pp. 131, 132. Printed for private circulation by G. Kolff and Co., Batavia.

† This phrase is usually applied to the French and other allied systems in which gold is the standard but cannot be demanded as of right.

one stage to another can be performed in a very smooth and simple way. It would also confirm our impression that in some cases the gold exchange system is rather a name given to a temporary situation, than a preconceived system.'

This passage reflects correctly the attitude which Mr Conant and I adopted in regard to Nicaragua. Of late there has been a tendency to make a fetish of exchange standards. So soon as a country has adequate resources, in gold behind or in its currency, it can use that gold wholly within its borders, as is the practice in England, France and Germany, or partly within and partly without its borders, so as to meet either adverse balances abroad or the purchase of material to replenish a token circulation.

The present state of affairs in India can be exhibited in a form which any one can understand, and which could be permanently utilised. At present there is no real distinction between the rupee and the note. Both are liabilities of the Government to be kept at a parity with gold. One is a note printed on silver and the other a note printed on paper. I propose to treat them alike, merging the gold standard reserve accounts in the paper currency department accounts. In so doing I estimate the existing rupee circulation at 160 crores* (exclusive of those held against the note circulation). The broad issues are not affected by the correctness of this figure, which is mainly used as a jumping-off ground. I exclude the fourteen crores† of Government rupee paper, for it is simpler to cancel them. Nothing is really gained by holding your own debt against your own liability.

As at the 31st March, 1913.

<i>Dr.</i>	<i>Cr.</i>
Circulation { 160 crores of rupees 68 crores of notes	*Rupees . . 22'45 crores †Gold . . . 41'00 Gold securities 25'50
	Total . . 88'95
	Uncovered. . 139'05
Total . . 228 crores	Total . . 228'00 crores

* Includes 6 crores now held in the gold standard reserve.

† Includes gold held in England in the gold standard reserve.

* A crore of rupees is two-thirds of a million sterling.

† As a matter of fact some of these securities are no longer rupee paper. The argument is not affected if this be so.

That is to say, counting in the silver held on the credit side of the account, Government now holds about 39 per cent. of its liabilities for notes and silver rupees. If we omit the silver, the holding in gold and gold securities is 66½ crores, or about 29 per cent.; or, taking gold alone, about 18 per cent.* I should prefer to see the securities converted into gold and not less than 30 per cent. so held. The India Office has never appreciated the fundamental difference between holding gold and holding gold securities. If at times of crisis gold antecedently withdrawn is released, the effect is to increase the supply when the demand is intense, whereas the sale of securities in such a situation is to increase the demand when the supply is inadequate. As regards the location of the gold held by Government, which would amount to over 66 crores according to the plan outlined above, a decision is necessary. If half were kept in England, this would mean the earmarking of over 20 millions sterling at the Bank of England; and the rest could be held by the Government in India available for issue against the circulating medium, and as a reserve in case of financial and monetary crises.

The future policy might be to issue further notes or rupees, as the public may require. For each lakh of notes issued 20 per cent. might be laid aside in gold, say 50 per cent. in silver and 30 per cent. in short-dated securities (held in London); and for each lakh of rupees 70 per cent. of the profit might be laid aside in gold, and 30 per cent. in short-dated securities (held in London). These percentages are given more as practical illustrations than considered opinions, to show how the system could be worked. If those initially selected were found to need revision, there should be no difficulty in making a change. Elasticity could be attained by issuing uncovered notes during the periods of active trade somewhat after the manner suggested in my evidence (Q. 10314). The suggestion that at such times the metallic reserve should be raided will not commend itself to prudent banking opinion. The proper medium for such expansion, if practicable, is notes.

* The monetary situation, from the standpoint of a gold standard, is really stronger than it would appear from this presentment, for no account is here taken of the gold in the outside circulation.

I come now to the second head of the discussion—the custody of India's cash balances. At present India keeps such balances in its cash as are likely to be required for early disbursement, leaves with its bankers at the capital towns, in addition to certain agreed amounts, considerable sums, and withdraws the rest to reserve treasuries in the same manner as has been done in the United States of America. The Secretary of State is notified of the amounts so held at his disposal in the reserve treasuries, and withdraws the whole of them as opportunity offers, by means of council drafts to London. There they are used to pay India's liabilities in London, and if there is a surplus, in lieu of borrowing.

The practice of withdrawing these balances to reserve treasuries, pending their transfer to London, has been acutely criticised on the ground that it seriously hampers India's internal trade, a good deal of the revenue being land revenue which is inevitably taken when the crops are harvested, though the money so withdrawn would be of especial value in this busy season of trade. The reply is made that, in the past, Government was not able to recover its resources from the Banks when it required them, and that therefore it is not safe to make these sums available in the market so long as the Government funds bear so large a proportion to the total funds available. The same line of argument has been taken in America until the recent legislation. The consequence in India is curiously anomalous. The Banks of Bengal, Bombay and Madras, commonly called the Presidency Banks, which are the ultimate reserves of the country, and to which the Exchange Banks look for assistance, are cold-shouldered, while the funds which they could utilise are carried off to London, and not infrequently lent to the very Banks which lean upon them in India.

Obviously the remedy is to keep these balances more and more in India as the Indian money market broadens. The Commission recommends a step in this direction by suggesting that monies be lent to the Presidency Banks more frequently than has hitherto been the practice. I should prefer to see the Presidency Banks strengthened by an infusion of State interest and control, so that the help could be given in the ordinary course of events by increasing the Government balances

held by them. If regard be had to considerations of helping the market by the lending of public funds, there is always a danger that the requirements of Government will no longer be the sole consideration in estimating its cash balances.

Whatever course be pursued it is, however, quite certain that the cash balances remitted to London will always be very considerable, and it is inevitable and proper that part of them should be employed at interest. Lord Inchcape and others have explained the practice followed. A list is kept in the India Office of approved banks or institutions to which the official broker could lend. The first bank on the list is the National Provincial Bank of England, of which Lord Inchcape, formerly Chairman of the Finance Committee, is a director. The second is the Union Bank, whose chairman, Sir Felix Schuster, succeeded Lord Inchcape as chairman of the Finance Committee. The third bank is the London, County and Westminster, of which Sir Montague Turner, a former partner of Lord Inchcape, is a director. The fourth is the London, City and Midland, of which Sir Edward Holden is chairman. The fifth is Glyn, Mills, Currie and Co., in which Mr Bertram Currie, a former member of Council, was a partner, and in which Mr Laurence Currie, a member of the Finance Committee, is now a partner. At the commencement, the list was a more or less close borough of a few banks, which became gradually extended as the funds grew beyond their capacity to absorb, and as the City became generally aware that funds were on offer. This is clear from a letter from Lord Inchcape (then Sir James Mackay) to Sir Edward Holden which Lord Inchcape read before the Commission. It runs as follows :

‘DEAR SIR EDWARD HOLDEN,

‘The Secretary of State has considerable amounts of spare balances which he deposits from time to time with London banks, and the business of arranging these deposits is entrusted to me as Chairman of the Finance Commission. Hitherto the deposits have been made with the National Provincial, the London, County and Westminster, and the Union of London—they run into large amounts—and it has occurred to me you might be glad to have the opportunity of securing some of the business. I expect we shall have some

fresh money for deposit within the next week or two, and if you care for it I shall ask our broker, Scott of Nivison's, to call and see you when the time comes. You might let me know. You will treat this communication as confidential.—Yours, etc., JAS. L. MACKAY.'

This remarkable document sheds a flood of light on the subject beyond the candle-power of comment; and every one will agree in the conclusion reached by the Commission that the system is in need of radical revision. Supposing, however, arrangements are made so that these monies can be lent to the highest responsible bidder in open market, some consideration for the interests of the City should be required of England's greatest dependency. The presence of a large lender who injects or removes very large sums is a matter of great concern to a sensitive money market which depends on the Bank rate as its sole defence against inconvenient withdrawals of gold. From India's standpoint the simplest solution would be to turn the business over to the Bank of England. Whether this is at all practicable cannot be discussed within the limits of this article, for it raises large issues of Bank policy. Possibly means might be devised by which the Bank could notify weekly sums available for loan by India and the dates of repayment. Failing this, the best course might be to add the Governor or a prominent member of the Court to the Finance Committee. The presence of the Bank of England member would at least ensure the Bank having first-hand knowledge of the quantity of money coming on to the market and enable it to exercise a legitimate influence in determining the periods for which the loans were made.

Thirdly, we have to consider the desirability, or otherwise, of a Central Bank. If a Central Bank be established in India with a London Committee, matters could be conveniently arranged by appointing to it representatives of all interests, including the Bank of England. This course would also possess the great merit of relieving the India Office of its present liability to party attacks, while it could retain through its representative such voice in decisions of policy as might be deemed desirable.

This is, however, only one consideration, and not one

of the most important, to be weighed. To appreciate the others we must first glance at the financial conditions in India. At present the banking work is done by three classes of institution—the Presidency Banks, the Exchange Banks, and the Local Banks. The Presidency Banks finance the ordinary internal and urban trade of the country. The Exchange Banks confine themselves mainly to dealing in bullion and financing the export trade. The Local Banks do a good deal of what the irreverent subaltern calls 'pop-shop' business, lend on shares, and dabble in loans secured on mortgages, besides doing a certain amount of ordinary banking. The largest dealer in the internal exchanges is the Government, owing to the number of its treasuries and the magnitude of its operations.

So far the Presidency and Exchange Banks have worked happily together, each taking a sphere of activity which does not impinge on the preserves of the other. The Presidency Banks would like to have the power of borrowing in London. The Exchange Banks would like to enter the interior. Neither of them, however, makes a move, being alike of opinion that division of interest is better than competition. The arrangement works well, and each class does its business efficiently. Whether competition would be more for the public interest is difficult of determination, but on the whole it probably would. For somewhat similar reasons both the Presidency and the Exchange Banks are loud in praise of the Government management of the paper currency and the internal exchanges. Having passed my life in the conduct of this business, I am naturally of opinion that it is well done, though I think improvement is practicable. But I confess to taking this chorus of commendation with a liberal pinch of salt. The Presidency Banks realise that the alternative would be to hand over the business to them at the price of Government control and participation in profits, while, as things are, they are (rightly) in the position of the most favoured customer. The Exchange Banks, for their part, know perfectly well that the amalgamation of the Government and Presidency Bank business without readjustment of the currency system would handicap them completely out of the internal exchange and banking business.

At present there is a conflict of interest between the Government, as representing the general public, and the Banks in regard to the internal exchanges. In a large country metallic currency and notes are always at an *agio* or a discount, as the floods of business advance or recede. The policy of the Government in regard to its treasury balances is to move them at the least expense to the taxpayer, and, while giving a preference to the Presidency Bank as their largest client, to endeavour to treat all comers alike without exacting the last anna of profit obtainable by way of premium. Where, however, the Presidency Banks have a branch and the custody of the Government balances, there is a tendency towards monopoly as against other banks. Strictly speaking, the Bank has to account for Government receipts in the form in which it receives them, and pay out for Government in the form which is reasonable. Practically, this is hardly possible. Suppose, by way of illustration, that 'A' has to pay Government a lakh of rupees as land revenue. If rupees are at a premium, it is to the Bank's interest to get those rupees into its own account and credit Government with a lakh's worth of notes, which are at a slight discount. If notes are at a premium the Bank's interest is reversed. Similarly if payments are to be made. 'B' is a Government contractor and is owed a lakh of rupees. If 'B' is a client of the Bank, it is to the Bank's interest to credit itself with rupees or notes, whichever are at a premium. If 'B' is a client, say, of the National Bank of India, the Presidency Bank branch will pay him in the currency which is at discount, or partly in one form and partly in another.

If the interest of Government and that of the Presidency Banks were amalgamated, this undesirable conflict of interest would disappear, and the other Banks could be protected by working the currency so that these *agios* and discounts would be reduced, viz. by multiplying encashment centres and reducing the rates for transfer drafts. At present, Government treasuries, where there are no branches of the Presidency Banks, are managed by Government officers, whose time is only partially given to treasury work, and whose principal native subordinate is not infrequently in his private capacity himself a banker. The system is not a good one, and I think

should be replaced by handing over the treasuries to be worked by the Presidency Banks as a State department, much as a company works a State railway. This change would probably also result in a beneficial extension of the use of paper currency and bank drafts in lieu of cash.

The opinion has already been expressed that the tendency should be to leave the balances held in the Reserve treasuries more and more with the Presidency Bank. It is further my view that they should be allowed access to the London money market, the interests of the Exchange Banks being most carefully safeguarded. These changes, viz. the surrender of the district treasuries, the custody of the large cash balances, and the grant of the power to borrow in London, could hardly be carried out without altering materially the constitution of the Presidency Banks. They would require to be stiffened by the addition of official directors; and a goodly proportion of the profits over what is enough to secure present shareholders from loss on their holdings should go to the State. The same result could be obtained by the creation of a Central Bank. There are advantages in the idea, particularly in regard to the currency system. But at present public opinion is distinctly adverse. It is almost always better to improve existing systems than to pull things up by the roots. The proposal is generally accompanied by suggestions to raise the aggregate capital, in order to invite confidence, whereas it is sounder to leave such considerations purely to the touchstone of the volume of profitable business to be done. Moreover, it would be difficult to secure a competent board. The best men cannot be perpetually running off to distant board meetings. Even if competent men be found, they will be constantly changing, to the detriment of continuity of policy and knowledge; for successful men do not stay long in the East. Bank affairs are best run on the spot without much interference from a distance. It is also to be remembered that the main business of each Presidency Bank is very distinct. Jute in Bengal and rice in Burmah occupy the Bank of Bengal, cotton that of Bombay.

If the banks are amalgamated, the natural consequence will be the establishment of a London Committee. The relief of the India Office from political

attacks may, however, be very dearly purchased by the amount of top-hamper imposed. And the temptation will always be considerable to remove India's resources to London before they are needed, or when they could be locally employed.

The question of the changes, if any, advisable in the note system, should the constitution of the Presidency Banks be remodelled, has intentionally been left to the last, because it is the most thorny. The monetary advisers of China, men of great ability and knowledge of the subject, advocate the issue of notes from a Central Bank somewhat on the lines of the Bank of France. The recent United States legislation is on the same lines as regards the principle guiding the note issue, but it creates from eight to twelve Federal Reserve Banks, which correspond more or less closely to the Central Bank suggested for China. The Bank of France has no limit, theoretically, to its issues beyond its lending power. As it is managed with great caution and consummate ability, not merely does no harm result from this freedom, but we get the curious result that in practice its issues are more fully secured in hard cash than they would be under a rigid system. In China and America limits are imposed both in regard to cash held against demand deposits and notes issued.

In England and Germany a distinction is in effect drawn between notes and credit. Notes in these countries are really hard money; and it is left to private enterprise to use cheques and other instruments of credit for the immense transactions of the business world. In Germany provision is made for the uncovered issues of notes to meet the greater need for hard money when the tide of business is flowing fast. In England no such provision exists; but in times of crisis, by suspension of the Bank Act, notes would become forced legal tender.

Whatever be the advantages of the French system of issuing notes to the extent of bills offering for discount, it would never be practicable to introduce into India a system so unsuitable to a backward country and so alien to British conditions and sentiment. If the system outlined on page 474 is adopted, it should not be impracticable to make it over to the Presidency Banks after they have been remodelled. Difficulties would arise regarding

their respective liabilities for notes, especially for the large notes used in remittances. Perhaps it might be necessary for each to mark its respective issues of the high-value notes so that their mutual positions could be adjusted by means of a clearing house at Delhi; or possibly a nexus could be created by a reference in cases of dispute to an annual joint conference presided over by the Financial Member of Council.

To recapitulate: India should possess a currency sufficiently rich in gold for it to be available in internal crises and against foreign drains. Such a currency will gradually assume the more economical form of a paper currency backed by gold, which will occupy a less important position in the general circulation. The management of the currency and the custody of the Government balances are best effected by a fusion of State and private interests. England, being only able to retain such gold as her habits and resources permit, need not regard with misgiving a growing absorption of the residue by her greatest dependency. On the contrary, the presence of twenty millions sterling of Indian gold in the vaults of the Bank of England would strengthen incalculably the Bank's precarious hold of its slender store. Should the Straits Settlements, East and West Africa, and other dependencies beyond the seas adopt a similar procedure, the position of the Empire would be strengthened to the common advantage.

F. C. HARRISON.

Art. 10.—THE NEW GREECE.

1. *The Broom of the War God.* By H. N. Brailsford. London : Heinemann, 1898.
2. *Letters from Greece.* By John Mavrogordato. London : Secker, 1914.
3. *Greeks, Bulgars, and English Opinion.* By Z. Duckett Ferriman. London : Bonner, 1913.
4. *Hellas and the Balkan Wars.* By D. J. Cassavetti. London : Fisher Unwin, 1914.

Twice before in history there has been a New Greece. In the centuries that followed the conquest of the Greek world by Rome, it looked as if, politically and morally, the race were dead. The poets could write of the supremacy of Greek culture, but the Hellenised Romans of Horace's and Virgil's days saw that the Greeks who were their contemporaries lacked the qualities that make for government—strength of purpose, grit, and staying power.) When the New Greece came, hardly two centuries after Horace wrote, it was character that came first. There was a pressure of barbarians upon the eastern frontiers of the Roman Empire; and it was the Hellenised East that stood in the way of invasion. The responsibilities of the situation, the fact that once again, as at Marathon and Salamis, they were the acknowledged bulwark of civilisation against barbarism, helped the Greeks to realise their new political importance. Plutarch's book of 'Parallel Lives' is the political tract that ushered in the new era. On the one side he justifies the character, the political capacity, of the ancient Greeks, forgotten in the course of the centuries. He sets the two races, Greek and Roman, man for man, one over against the other, and shows that Greeks too could fight and govern. On the other side he makes his countrymen feel that there was glory to be won in adapting themselves to new conditions and taking their share in the government of the cosmopolitan empire. Before a century was out, Greek officers were commanding Roman troops in a border war, and a Greek was governor of a province. It was the deep-seated public spirit of the race that made possible the long history of the Byzantine Empire, Roman in organisation, Christian in religion, Greek in language.

Yet, though the East got its Dark Ages centuries later than the West, they came at last. The eleventh Constantine fell in the breach by the Cannon Gate, and for nearly four hundred years the Greek race resigned itself once more to commerce and religion, and the handing on from generation to generation of its indomitable hopes. The story of the second revival of Greece is familiar to Englishmen, because of the impression it made on our own poets; and we need not dwell on it. For both Byron and Shelley, Greece stood for political as well as for intellectual freedom. Throughout the struggle for liberty, which began in 1790, and went on intermittently during Byron's life, contemporary Greece came once more on the scene, as it did in Roman days, to interpret its ancestry. How far can it be said that once again, since Navarino was won and independence gained in 1827, there have been dark ages? Certainly only in a limited and sublimated sense. Material progress has been great ever since those days. / No town in Europe has more steadily advanced in riches, in fine buildings, in the general amenities of life, than Athens. / To those who revisit it at intervals of a few years, each visit seems to mark an epoch. The contrast between Athens and towns still under Ottoman domination has been growing ever more marked. Nor is the contrast a material one alone. Smyrna enjoys every advantage of commerce and position that belongs to Athens; its population is largely Greek. Yet, because that population is not free to work out its own salvation, to pass from Smyrna to Athens has been, any time these fifty years, to leave the middle ages for the modern world. Greece, as a national entity, has throughout been a refining and civilising force.

Still, as in the days of Horace, culture is not everything. The Greek had the defects of his qualities, and the most serious of them all was his love of talk, and, as young archæologists dubbed it, his cult of the black coat. The ideal of the leisured Intellectual was more general than in other nations, and was made the easier of fulfilment by a natural frugality and a willingness to do without material comforts. The ambitious young man's one object was to give up agriculture or industrial work as soon as he could, and settle in a town, preferably Athens, to take up law or politics. The traditions of the

past were in the blood; and no tradition was stronger than the love of politics for its own sake. There was a danger of his becoming the 'sort of political man' which Kipling makes his typical ancient Greek in his 'Finest Story of the World'; the quintessence of what a Spartan felt, and Aristophanes said, about the rank-and-file Athenian of the Enlightenment.

It would no doubt be easy to exaggerate this weakness. The revolutionaries of the Military League of 1909, in their efforts to introduce a more virile spirit into national life, naturally made sweeping charges and, to press home their points, painted the evil in vivid colours. <There were among leading Greek politicians many men whose patriotism was as pure as is to be found in any other country. None the less, >the material strength and prosperity of the people was not broad-based enough for all this superstructure of political excitement. <The building was top-heavy. The danger would not have been so serious had it not been connected with the problem of 'unredeemed' Greece across the borders. The population of the Kingdom of Greece was only 2,500,000, while at least twice as many Greeks lived in different parts of Turkey. There were two effects of this strange survival from the days of the Byzantine Empire. It was easy for enterprising and adventurous Greeks to leave the Kingdom and seek their fortunes as merchants elsewhere among congenial fellow countrymen. All over the Levant there were Greek colonies which brought to the Kingdom of Greece no corresponding political advantages, but were rather a drain on national efficiency. If, however, the Greek communities in Turkey had in the main been colonies of prosperous merchants—as in fact they were in Constantinople and Smyrna, and in other parts of the world such as London and Paris—the matter would have been a comparatively simple one. But the vast mass of the 'unredeemed' were humble people, peasants or small traders. There was scarcely a family in Greece that had not friends or kinsmen suffering from Turkish oppression in Crete, Epirus or Macedonia. If we had been a small, poor nation, and more Uitlanders of English blood had been living in the Transvaal than there were Englishmen in England, and had the government of the Boers been

as bad as that of Turkey, we should have had the same problem to face fifteen years ago that Greece has had to face ever since it was a kingdom. It was not financial greed or love of conquest, but a passionate sympathy for the oppressed of its own race that was the danger and difficulty, as now under happier auguries it has proved the inspiration, of Greek statesmanship.

But our South African analogy needs further qualification. It would only hold if the Transvaal had been from time immemorial the home of our race, and we had been dispossessed of it. Ever since the Turk took Constantinople there has been in the mind of every Greek a hope, so dominant that it was known as *ἡ ἰδέα*, *the idea*, that one day he would win back his inheritance. Greek boys and girls, throughout those four hundred years and more, have sung the old song with full intention :

πῆραν τὴν πόλιν, πῆραν, πῆραν τὴ Σαλονίκη.*

Our Lady and the images of the Saints shed tears, but the poet comforts them :

Σώπασε, κύρα δέσποινα, μὴν κλαίγῃς, μὴ δακρύζῃς·
Πάλε μὲ χρόνους, μὲ καιρούς, πάλαι δικά μας εἶναι.†

It was this enthusiasm, unsupported by efficiency or organisation, that led to the disastrous war with Turkey in 1897. It was entered into lightly and without preparation, with no one at the head of the Government or the army who had the courage to tell, or indeed to face, the truth; and it led to what looked likely to be the permanent humiliation of Greece before Turkey.

The shame of those twelve years burnt deep into the Greek soul. Few Englishmen were aware that the weaknesses of the Greek nation had all along been felt as keenly in Greece itself as they were by strangers, and that a growing body of public opinion in the educated classes was struggling against them. Varatássis, who fell in the war of 1897 commanding the Foreign Legion, and became the hero of H. N. Brailsford's story, 'The Broom of the War God,' had plenty of friends left to

* 'They have taken the city, they have taken it, they have taken Salonica.'

† 'Be of good cheer, Lady, cease from tears and weeping.
After a season, after years, it will be our own again.'

succeed him. Indeed, Brailsford's disillusionment as to the people for whom (as surely no Greek should forget) he went out when not much more than a boy, and fought and got his wounds, was largely due to a lack of political insight as to the death of Varatássis. To Brailsford it seemed a symbol of the end of everything, the break-up of all his hopes and ideals for Hellas. In reality it was the beginning of everything, the birthday of the new Greek spirit.

Though there is this much excuse for Brailsford's later depreciation of Greece, that he never visited the kingdom after 1909, it is surprising that he failed to see the way things were tending in Crete and Macedonia, where he had good opportunities for forming a judgment. The virility and sturdiness of the Cretan Greeks he did realise; but he saw it as a thing apart, as something which had no bearing on Greek character as a whole but only served as an ironic contrast. The Macedonian situation he failed to understand; and his honest but mistaken book, 'Macedonia,' published in 1906, did more than anything else to poison English Liberal opinion against Greece. What he saw was that, when he visited Macedonia, the Bulgarians were largely in possession, especially in the country districts, and that the Greeks were making desperate efforts to reassert themselves. He saw that the feeling between the two races was bitter, and that the Turks, anxious to preserve the balance of power, were at the moment rather inclined to favour the Greeks. What he did not allow for was that this was but a phase in a secular struggle, in which the balance of sentiment—and of cruelty—swayed now this way, now that. The permanent factors in the situation were a sincere belief on the part of both Christian races that the country was rightly theirs, a floating mass of peasants not decidedly identified with either of them, and an alien Government strong enough to prevent open war, but too weak to prevent what was far more corrupting and destructive, brigandage and blood-feud. It was unreasonable to expect the Greeks to acquiesce in the success of the Bulgarian propaganda of the eighties and nineties. Their own claim to Macedonia was based on thousands of years of tradition and possession, and they knew that the recent success of the rival

race was due to a short-sighted piece of ecclesiastical bigotry, and some supineness on their own part.

Sir Valentine Chirol has lately pointed out* that, when he collected statistics thirty years ago in a place that is now so confidently claimed as Bulgarian as the town of Monastir, 'the Bulgarians themselves did not pretend even to one-third of the population—an excessive claim anyhow.' That even to-day there is still a large floating population is illustrated by some incidental remarks in the depositions of Macedo-Bulgars given in the official Bulgarian version of the 'Atrocities'† of the second war. Thus we hear (p. 119) that the father of a Bulgarian soldier with the good Slav name of Spassoff was a 'bulgare grécisant.' Another 'bulgare grécisant' called Popoff (p. 118) is credited with some of the worst acts attributed to the Greek side; and so also are two Vlaques, one of whom 'ne savait pas du tout le grec et parlait bulgare' (p. 121). It was difficult to be sure what the sympathies of a given village would be. A company of the 70th Regiment lost its way and got trapped (p. 128). 'Nous croyons que les paysans de ce village fussent des bulgares. Nous nous sommes trompés. C'étaient des grécisants.'

However true it may be that, at moments, the propaganda of both races resolved itself into crude intimidation, they are not to be judged by such by-products. The competition in school-building, with its effort to attract to one culture or the other the young generation of the unattached and miserable peasantry, was in itself both natural and wholesome. In 1900 the Bulgarians had 785 schools in Macedonia, with 1250 teachers and 39,892 pupils; the Greeks (the figures are taken for 1901) 927 schools, with 1397 teachers and 57,607 pupils.‡ No doubt all these children were not originally Greeks. But it was an immense credit to the Greeks that they tried to make them so. That Greek pretensions, based on this educational campaign, only led to still keener and bitterer racial feeling, was a distressing but inevitable result of the general conditions

* 'Times,' Aug. 14, 1913.

† 'Atrocités Grecques en Macédoine.' Sophia, 1913.

‡ J. D. Bouchier's figures in 'Encyclopædia Britannica,' Ed. XI.

of Ottoman rule. The policy of playing off one race against another was not an invention of Abdul Hamid's; but no one did it with greater skill. How many of the violent deeds that were done by either Greek or Bulgar bands during those years were due to private and kindly information that a similar atrocity had been just done by the other side in the next valley!

We can form a sounder judgment of the Greek propaganda in Macedonia from one insignificant but widely circulated document of the time than from all the depreciative comments in Brailsford's book. It is an Easter card, with 'Christ is risen' printed across it, and is a 'memento from Macedonia.' Macedonia lies enclosed in the red crescent of Ottoman rule, and in it is a heart, with the red blood of the 'Greek spirit' flowing from it. The shears of Pan Slavism are cutting it, and the Austrian snake is making through it to Salonica, and the arrows of Bulgarian propaganda and Servian propaganda and Roumanian propaganda are piercing it. And in the centre of the heart is a cross, and the words 'Mother Church, help me!' To the average Greek this was not insincere or sentimental; it was as true an expression of national emotion as that which inspired Holland against Spain, or Italy against Austria, or the Boers against ourselves.

Even if the by-products of this revolutionary movement had been worse than they were, the keen observer might have seen that the action and danger which it involved was likely to brace the character. For men like Paul Melás, the Greek officer who died in it in 1904, the movement stood for a great ideal and high action. 'There were words, words all round him'; 'ὅλα εἶνε λέξεις,' says the author of 'The Blood of Martyrs and Heroes,' 'καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἀποφάσισε νὰ δώσῃ ὅτι εἶχε. Καὶ εἶχε τὸν ἑαυτό του.' ('And Paul decided to give what he had. And he had himself.') The need for sincerity and endurance, the futility of mere rhetoric, is the moral of the whole of that remarkable book, in which, under his pen-name of Idas, Ion Dragoumis tells the story of his friend; 'ἂν τρέξουμε νὰ σώσουμε τὴ Μακεδονία, ἐμεῖς θὰ σωθοῦμε.' ('If we go to save Macedonia, it is we who shall be saved.') Idas's book is dedicated 'To the Young'; and throughout it there are visions of a 'New Greece,' hardy and brave,

the child of war and danger. Such a New Greece was already growing; and Idas expressed what was in thousands of minds. To a progressive of Western Europe, national regeneration, couched in terms of war and conquest, is naturally suspect; it brings to his mind the sinister ideas of Militarism and Jingoism. When the Greek revival found concrete expression, two years after Idas wrote, in the formation of the Military League, and the army dictated terms to the civil power, the true meaning of the movement was obscured by this very prejudice. 'The League's domestic programme,' said the 'Manchester Guardian' (Nov. 1, 1909), 'is professional, and its foreign programme is Jingoism.' In point of fact, expenditure on armaments was but one item in the programme of the Military League. It was a general attack on corruption, sinecures, softness, weakness, in every department of public life; and it scourged all alike without any trace of professional narrowness. It is difficult for the progressive to realise that there is a stage in the history of many peoples when regeneration is bound to express itself in military terms. To make the perfect man or the perfect nation, soul and body have to find their balance; and softness can only be cured by a cultivation of the sterner and what, if in their turn exaggerated, might well be called the grosser qualities. In the Greek movement there was nothing that can be rightly called Militarism or Jingoism. There was no desire to aggrandise, or to form, a military caste. There was no attempt to exploit sentiment for commercial profit. The paraphernalia of military pomp were just what men prayed to be delivered from. National vain-glory was anathema. The spirit of the 'black coat' had gone under. Varatássis and Melás were dominant.

It was no doubt fortunate that, before it went too far, the movement was guided back into constitutional channels. This was due to the consummate patience of King George, and to the flexibility of mind of one of the older statesmen, Stephanos Dragoumis. They bridged over the difficult months before there came over from Crete the man who gathered in himself all that Young Greece had longed and striven to be, Eleutherios Venizélos. Even Venizélos could have done nothing if the seeds of life

had not already been there. His success is itself a proof of the soundness of the race. But no national revival ever found a more ideal leader. In appearance, Venizélos is curiously like the bust of Pericles by Cresilas in the British Museum. The first impression is one of benevolence and moderation. There is humour about the mouth and in the eyes. When he smiles—and here we have no warrant for the Cresilas—he shows white and beautiful teeth. When you have looked at him you are as much surprised as when you look at Pericles, to think that you have had before you a stern, determined man, a soldier as well as a statesman. It would be interesting to learn whether Venizélos knows his Thucydides. His method of dealing with Athenians is amazingly like that of his predecessor. Never has Venizélos spoken *πρὸς ἡδονήν*. Whether it was Thessalian peasants demanding the expropriation of landholders, or non-commissioned officers objecting to severe things said of them by the French Military Mission, or excited crowds incited by an insidious opposition to raise the 'No Popery' cry of Greece—that the sacred classical tongue was in danger at the hands of the *μαλιαροί*, or the long-haired romantics who wanted to write literature as the common people talked and must therefore be traitors—he said the straight, unpleasant thing, even if it was on the eve of a general election. And the more unpleasant things he said, the more the nation worshipped him. Every party leader united against him, every man prominent in the old régime except Dragoumis. But, when once again he appealed to the country, a manhood suffrage electorate gave him more than 140 seats in the Boulé out of 160. No wonder that Greece could work and fight as one man.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the satisfactory results of this leadership, either before the campaign of the Allies against Turkey began, or during that campaign itself. It was Venizélos who, as Gueschoff, the Bulgarian Premier, himself stated, initiated the Balkan League. Young Greece, in its very determination to challenge Bulgaria's right to Macedonia, had learnt to admire her vigour and strength of purpose; and it was the elder Greek statesmen alone who criticised the alliance. Old racial hatreds seemed likely to sink in the glow of a common enterprise. The Young-Turk revolution had

unconsciously done much to help on this tendency. The finer spirits in that movement rose superior to Abdul Hamid's methods of playing off one race against the other. To the rank and file also, occupied with their idea of the Ottomanisation of all the subject races, those methods seemed mistaken, involving as they did the accentuation of the very national differences which they were anxious to smooth away. Above all, the parliamentary régime which was then inaugurated, imperfect though it was, suggested the advisability of the Christian races combining on a common platform for electioneering purposes. The fact that such an arrangement was come to between Greeks and Bulgarians was significant, and, as we shall see later, the character of this arrangement was scarcely less so.

The Balkan League was formed; and in the war that followed Greece played a part that surprised her former detractors. The French Military Mission, relying on a whole-hearted government support, which, happily for Greece, Turkey had never given to her advisers, did wonders for the organisation and discipline of the army. General Eydoux showed firmness in introducing changes, and tact in identifying himself with all that was characteristic in national feeling. Officers and men responded to this good French soldiering, and, when war came, the race as a whole responded. Not only did no one fail who was due to serve, but volunteers came at their own expense from Greek colonies all over the world, so that the total in the field, exclusive of irregulars, amounted to 216,000. As many as 57,000 came from the United States alone, and left a remarkable impression behind them by their exodus; America had hitherto witnessed the reverse process when other European wars began. The troops marched well, and fought well, and, though they had not as heavy work to do as the Bulgarians had in Thrace, their capture of the fortress of Janina was a considerable military achievement, and reflected great credit on the Crown Prince and his home-trained chief of the staff, General Dousmánis. It is encouraging, for other nations than the Greek, that there is no indication that the black-coats of the cities, once possessed of their new spirit, were less brave, or bore hardships less readily,

than the peasants. Students and schoolmasters, lawyers and merchants, formed a larger proportion of the Greek army than they do of most armies; but, instead of lowering the general physical stamina, they supplied an element of initiative and capacity to the isolated infantry unit that is essential in modern war. Above all, the Greek fleet did incalculable service to the allied cause by holding up Turkish reinforcements. Travellers who were in Asia Minor during the campaign agree that its resources were practically untapped, and that there were masses of men there whom the Greek command of the sea made it impossible to bring into action.

It has been remarked above that the Bulgarians had the heaviest work to do in this campaign against Turkey. It was a misfortune for Bulgaria. It is difficult not to believe you are a fine fellow when everybody tells you so; and the fact that Bulgaria had had the hardest job to do was accepted by the European Press as proving that she alone could have done it. The division of the spoil was admittedly a difficult matter. The fortune of war had placed Serbia in military occupation of Northern and Central Macedonia. If military occupation alone were to decide the matter, Bulgaria would obtain little of Macedonia; and it was Macedonia more than anything else that Bulgaria had set her heart on. The district of Monastir, in particular, had for years been the centre of Bulgarian propaganda. Greece, too, was in possession of Salonica; and Salonica was one of the richest prizes of the war. The matter was further complicated by a treaty signed, very shortsightedly, by Serbia, just before the war, in which she agreed that Central Macedonia was to go to Bulgaria, while the division of Northern Macedonia between them was to be submitted to the arbitration of Russia. As against the binding effect of this treaty, Serbia pleaded that the issue of the war had given all the unexpected advantages to the Bulgarians. At the outset Bulgaria had never hoped to keep Adrianople. On the other hand, the attitude of the Powers in refusing to give Serbia an outlet on the Adriatic had allowed her even less than she expected to get when the hopes of the Allies as a whole were far more modest. A

document issued while the controversy was in progress showed that, even on the Servian and Greek proposal, Bulgaria would maintain her supremacy in the Alliance. She would still have had 157,000 square kilometres of territory to Servia's 85,000, as against 96,000 and 48,000 before the war. On Bulgaria's proposal, Servia would in proportion have lost heavily, coming off with 75,000 to Bulgaria's 183,000.

A wise statesmanship would have found a way out of these difficulties. All that was essential for Servia was that she should have commercial access to the *Ægean*, now that she was denied it to the *Adriatic*. From this access she would be hopelessly barred if she were shut in on her southern as well as her eastern border by Bulgaria, and had no chance of free competition and alternative routes. If Bulgaria had faced this one vital point, and the fact that it probably entailed the sacrifice of Monastir, she would have found that there was plenty of territory left to bargain for. Servia did not want war, and would with little doubt have given up her claim to a large slice of Macedonia east of Uskub and Monastir. Bulgaria might perhaps have reconciled herself to the loss of Monastir, if she had had the insight to realise that the proposals made by Greece involved the abandonment of claims to territories as much bound up with the Greek 'idea' as Monastir was with her own. Hundreds of thousands of Greeks were being offered to Bulgaria in Thrace, while she was also to take over the flourishing Greek communities of Kavalla, Drama, and Serres, and control of the rich tobacco industry.

It is important in this connexion to recur to the election arrangements made with a view to the Ottoman Parliament by the Greek and Bulgarian communities a year before the war began. These arrangements, as the 'Dnewnik,' the Sofia organ of the Daneff party, assured us at the time, were made 'on the basis of official statistics and after lengthy deliberations.' For Thrace they allotted one seat to the Bulgarians, and eight to the Greeks. In the vilayet of Uskub (Kossovo) the Bulgarians were to have two seats, the Greeks none—it was Servia, of course, and not Greece, that claimed this district after the war. For the vilayet of Monastir, part of which after the war was in the Servian claim, the Bulgarians were to have

two seats, the Greek five. For the vilayet of Salonica, which on the Greek claim after the war was to be fairly evenly divided, the Bulgarians were to have three seats, the Greeks five. How can these figures, arrived at by mutual compromise and for mutual benefit, be explained away? Making all possible allowances for superior Greek skill in electioneering, or the superior influence and riches of the Greek communities, we are left with an ample margin. It remains that, according to the opinion of the Bulgarians of Thrace and Macedonia, they were in a hopeless minority in Thrace, while they were distinctly in a minority in that part of Southern and Eastern Macedonia which had *ex hypothesi* to be divided between them and the Greeks.

It was a real sacrifice that Venizélos was thus willing to make for the sake of peace and the maintenance of the Balkan League; but it must not be imagined that he carried his point without opposition. It was the crowning proof of his power that he was able to control the indignation that his loyalty to the League aroused. Early in March, 1913, a memorial was sent to the Boulé by the Greeks of Thrace and Eastern Macedonia; on the 14th it was submitted to the Chamber; and on the 15th two deputies raised the question of the Government's policy. The whole force of the Opposition, backed by an unusual body of public opinion outside, clamoured against the Prime Minister. 'Are such,' said Theotókis with bitter irony, 'the declarations of the "Liberator of Hellas"?' Venizélos's reply, which was never reported in the English Press, was a remarkable one, and is worth quoting at some length:

'I am aware,' he said, 'that there are those who are trying to stir up trouble among the Greek populations which without question will remain outside the Greater Greece. I want these populations to know from the lips of the responsible head of the Greek Government that those who urge on them such an attitude are the true enemies of their country, the true enemies of Hellenism. In other days—three years ago or more—it would have been difficult perhaps for a Prime Minister to dare to make such unpalatable revelations. But I, gentlemen, who have only been a few years among you, have come to the conclusion that in three years a tremendous change has come over the soul of the Greek people.

Every one does not see it; but it is so great that it permits, nay that it compels, the responsible head of the Greek Government to tell the truth to the people. It is natural that difficulties should have arisen as to the division of the conquered territory. One knows how strong national exclusiveness is. Each of the nations that have shared in this struggle for freedom, impelled by the national instinct, tries to obtain as large a share as possible. Each, in good faith, claims to have contributed most to the common cause. But the truth is different. All have contributed to their utmost. Each of the allied nations has concentrated all its resources, moral and material, to win a result which never would otherwise have been won. I have a conviction that the partition of the conquered territory will not be made by the military authorities, who have a limited horizon and look at matters from a merely military point of view, nor by the too fervid patriots of this State or that, but by these States' responsible Governments. . . . I hope their patriotism will be so lofty that they will not shrink from such sacrifices as will be inevitable if the partition is to ensure the continuance of the Alliance—even if they are bound to be called traitors by the fervid patriots of their own race.'

There may have been statesmen in Bulgaria who were capable of responding to this lofty conception of patriotism, but, if so, they did not carry their people with them, while Venizélos did. The direction of Bulgarian policy passed out of the hands of Gueschoff, the moderate and reasonable promoter of the original alliance, and was left more and more to men like Daneff, who even in the early negotiations that preceded the signing of the Treaty of London had astonished the diplomatic world by his truculent Chauvinism. That Venizélos, on the other hand, maintained his conciliatory attitude to the end, is clear not only from the response he made to those friends of the League in England who strove during May and June to avert hostilities, but from some curious revelations which were made in the Boulé at the end of last November. A subordinate member of the Government, M. Stratós, provoked by what he considered the Premier's high-handed action in asking him to send in his resignation, committed the grave indiscretion of charging him in the Press with having sacrificed Greek interests to maintain the Bulgarian alliance, with having for this object postponed till almost too late the conclusion

of a separate agreement with Serbia, and with having been thrown into complete despair by the repeated aggressions of the Bulgarians during the month of May in the district of the Panghaeon. Venizélos, in another great speech before the Boulé of Nov. 25, easily disposed of the accusations that he was unprepared or taken at a loss. But he did not deny that, up to the moment when hostilities were definitely begun by Bulgaria, he had done all in his power to keep the League together. To this end he offered Bulgaria Serres, Drama, and Kavalla. The fact that the war had had a favourable issue did not make him ashamed to admit that he had dreaded it. War was after all, prepare as you might, largely a matter of chance. 'My critics,' he said—and the remark shows the greatness of the man—'forget the misfortunes of the State which for thirty years has held the hegemony in the Balkan Peninsula.'

There is now, of course, no doubt that Bulgaria did in fact deliberately begin the second war. At the time, the copies of the orders to advance, captured on the field by the Servian army, and published in facsimile, were repudiated. Even so late as Aug. 30, three Bulgarian Professors, sure of hospitality in the columns of the 'Nation,' pleaded that 'the scattered distribution of the Bulgarian forces over a frontier of 600 miles is incompatible with the view that Bulgaria intended or began the war. Facsimiles of orders to advance can be shown on both sides.' The exigencies of domestic politics have long ago swept aside all such pleas. Gennadieff and the Austrian party, the 'Dnewnik,' the organ of the Russophiles, the 'Epoca,' which represents General Savoff, above all Gueschoff's 'Mir,' in a number so indiscreet that it was suppressed by the authorities, agree in only one item of the counter-accusations which bandy about responsibility for blunders between Ministers and Generals and King; and that is the charge that those orders to advance were genuine, and that Somebody, with a very capital 'S' indeed, issued them.* That Bulgarian statesmanship was incredibly foolish does not

* See a summary in the 'Manchester Guardian,' Dec. 1, 1913. The 'Cambana' of Sofia has further published documents implicating, among others, General Ivanoff. In the light of them, his disclaimers in the 'Nineteenth Century' (Dec. 1913, p. 1347) lose all value.

make it any the less true that it was also treacherous; and the murder of the Servian outposts is an act for which the country must long feel shame.

It has been difficult for English opinion to accept these bitter facts. When the second war began, the 'Nation' (July 5) refused to believe in Bulgarian defeats. The reports were attributed to Greek and Servian 'garrulousness'; 'and neither of them has any reputation to lose for accuracy.' It is very hard to get rid of, this 'Mirage Bulgare,' the picture so fondly and pathetically believed in of the wise, silent, practical nation, slow but sure, methodical and massive! How was it possible to believe that it was *they* who had been immoderate and vainglorious?

A few words about 'Atrocities.' The second war was bound to be a bitter one. The Bulgarians were maddened by the check they received in what they imagined would be the easiest of 'walk-overs.' The Greeks captured at Strumnitza a heavy silk standard fringed in gold and embroidered with the royal crown. The ladies of Sofia had worked on it the motto 'Forward to Athens.' That sort of thing only happens when a nation is secure of victory. The Greeks, on the other hand, had already been inflamed by the accounts they received of the treatment of some of the Greek villages occupied by the Bulgarians on the slopes of Mt Panghaeon. Pillage, murder and rape were alleged to have taken place on a large scale in this district during the month of May; and the phrases 'the Bulgarian atrocities,' 'Attila and his Huns' appeared in the Greek Press in June, two weeks before the war broke out.* Names and dates are given for many of these accusations; and the Bulgarian military governor of Doiran is quoted as saying to a Greek priest who asked him to restore a school, 'Not a Greek shall remain on Bulgarian territory.' Some of these accusations could very possibly not be substantiated, if we had the complete evidence before us in a court of law. For others, at least that amount of justification could probably be urged, that neighbours who had hated each other for generations regarded each other as in a

* See the 'Messager d'Athènes,' June 21, 1913, which also quotes an earlier number of the 'Akropolis.'

permanent state of war. Race feeling had been growing tense for many months. The whole countryside consisted of men who, potentially if not actually, were *franc-tireurs* on one side or the other, 'comitadjis,' or 'andartes,' as they are respectively called. I have studied the Bulgarian counter-accusations, and noted how completely they ignore these considerations. The peasants whose depositions are laid before us pose as simple harmless souls, surprised out of their peaceful avocations by an inroad of outrageous Greeks.

Take, for instance, as a test case, the affair of Akandjali, near Lake Doiran, on which the Bulgarians lay great stress. The Greek Cavalry are alleged to have been guilty of pillage and outrage there on the night of July 6. Eleven depositions, covering eight pages of print (pp. 88-95), profess to give us full details of what happened, and represent it as the result of wanton cruelty exercised on an unoffending population. The writer has taken pains to identify the body of cavalry in question, and has in his possession a signed letter from Colonel Zymvrakákis, its commander. It turns out that an unopposed search for rifles was in process, and that 700 had already been found and piled in waggons in the central square when firing began from a neighbouring house. Colonel Zymvrakákis himself and a sergeant were both wounded behind the left knee, so seriously that they were incapacitated for the rest of the war. Captain Linarás also fell, struck by eleven bullets in the hip and shoulder-blade, and was in danger of his life for many days. Supposing that the squadron did, in fact, get out of hand when they saw their officers shot at in this treacherous way, would it be a serious criticism on the Greek army? Although, however, we may grant it as an *à priori* probability that some revenge was taken, we can give no credence to the depositions of the villagers. With all their detail, they make not the slightest reference to the wounding of the Greek officers. The nearest approach to it is a solitary remark in one deposition that 'au moment de la remise des armes un fusil chargé partit par mégarde.'

One thing is clear. If the Greek army did commit any of the outrages that are charged against it by the Bulgarians, they admit at least this defence, that they were

acts of reprisals, done by men who were convinced that their enemies had already broken the laws of war. In the Bulgarian publication already alluded to, this question of priority is denied, and stress is laid on the fact that the incident at Akandjali occurred so early as July 6, and therefore some days before the admitted Bulgarian excesses at Demirhissar (July 8) and Doxato (July 13). The account of Akandjali is, as we have seen, discredited, but in point of fact the question of priority does not depend on Akandjali, nor, indeed, on anything that occurred in the first weeks of July. It is fixed by the logic of events before the war. Greece had practically no Bulgarian villages in their power till war was declared. With insignificant exceptions, they were in the occupation of the Servian or Bulgarian armies. Bulgaria, on the other hand, had had to deal with hundreds of thousands of Greeks, from Thrace to Eastern Macedonia; and the reports that reached Greece had given abundant reason to believe that the 'comitadjis' had been guilty of excesses. Such a conclusion does not imply that we join with writers like Mr Nevinson and Miss Durham, who shake their heads over the whole business, and argue that things are about as bad as they were in the old Turkish days. Race hatred is no doubt a disconcerting phenomenon to find in this twentieth century. It is a survival from centuries of Turkish misrule, a kink, like the attitude of the Southern States to the Negro, or the Spaniards' passion for bullfights. But the discovery that it exists should not influence our judgment of the character of a people, as we have got to know it by our private intercourse with individuals, or by our historical judgment of its national capacity. The difference between the Turks and the Christians of the Turkish Empire is not that the one people is capable of atrocities and the other not. It is that the one has for hundreds of years proved itself incapable of good government, and stands for stagnation and moral and intellectual death; while Greece, Bulgaria, and Servia, ever since they have won their freedom, have all alike ranged themselves on the side of progress and civilisation. It is history that justifies our optimism.

The appeasing of this race hatred is, indeed, the most pressing work that the Balkan peoples have before them.

A manifesto just issued by the English Balkan Committee * brings this out with true statesmanship. By no one will such a movement be supported more warmly than by Venizélos, the originator of the first Balkan League. In an interview with the 'Adversul' of Bucharest in the month of December he expressed the desire of Greece to live at peace with Bulgaria, and the conviction that the Balkan Confederation is even now no chimera, but that it will one day be realised on a large scale and include not only Bulgaria but Turkey.

That Greece will be a more important member of such a confederation than if the second war had never been fought, is a dramatic reward for her loyalty and moderation. Her territory has risen from 64,000 to 120,000 square kilometres, her population from 2,500,000 to 4,500,000. She will be able to maintain a considerable fleet, resting on the sound foundations of a seafaring people and a vigorous and growing mercantile marine.† Her army will reach a war strength of some 450,000 men. The new provinces will also give her what she has hitherto lacked, a large area of rich agricultural land. Tobacco will be only one of the products of Southern and Central Macedonia, when they are developed by energy and good government; but tobacco alone will be a great source of revenue. The total weight of Macedonian tobacco declared by the producers to the Turkish Régie for 1911-1912 was 24,000,000 kilos, or 52,000,000 lbs.; and the actual crop is certain to have been much greater. More than half of this tobacco is grown in the new Greek territory, and will be exported from Kavalla and Salonica. The Greek revenue before the war was only between five and six millions; in the course of a few years it may well be doubled. Nor need we fear as to the future of the New Greece. As the municipal elections only this last February have shown, Venizélos commands, as fully as ever, the confidence of the nation. He is only forty-nine, not long past the period of young and vigorous manhood when he carried his rifle as a rebel on the hills of Crete. King Constantine, whose name, with its echo of Byzantium, is as romantically

* Feb. 12, 1914.

† A. Andréades, 'Journal des Economistes' (Paris), Sept.-Oct. 1913.

attractive as his person and his temperament, is only forty-five. And the nation is sound. The blood and brains of Greeks in their settlements all over the world—in England, France, America, even in the little colony in Australia, unheard of before the war—are at its service. And in the New Greece the motto is 'Deeds, not words,' 'πράξεις καὶ ὄχι λόγια.'

Yet words are not unimportant. Literature can never be unimportant for a Greek. Taste, style, and feeling for poetry are in the blood of the race; and it is only the war between the spoken and the written word that has hampered self-expression. It is impossible in an article like the present to attempt to estimate the value of the young literary movement. One can only say that it is strangely little known, in England. Poems like 'The Unruffled Life' of Kósti Palamás, prose writings such as the 'Samothráke' of Ion Dragoumis, which brings home to us the charm and the burden of the Greek islands under Turkish rule, deserve a sympathetic interpreter. It is strange that there should be no representative of Modern Greek language and literature in the University of London. The funds necessary for a Readership are not excessive, and we might expect the most brilliant young scholars in Greece to be candidates. There could be no better way for the Greek colony in London to impress on the English world of letters the significance of the Renaissance of Greece.

It will, perhaps, serve as a warranty that even in the New Greece words follow deeds, though they no longer overwhelm them, if this article closes with a simple impromptu lament composed by peasants, and sung in a little village on the promontory of Tænarum a few days before Christmas, 1912.* It is a *μυρολόγι*, a keening in honour of the dead, like those of our own Irish peasants in Synge's 'Riders to the Sea.' The people are Black Mainiates, claiming descent from Sparta, who still, like the Scottish Highlanders, retain the clan feeling towards their old chieftains, the Mavromichali or House of Black Michael. The son of the house, Dimitri Livanás, had been killed in Epirus; and the lament over him is begun

* Written down by G. D. Manolákos, schoolmaster of Kotron, and published by Prof. N. G. Politis, in *Δογματικά*, vol. IV, Athens, June, 1913.

by Kouvarína, a woman from the neighbouring village of Kókkala, who had just lost her own son at Saran-taporon in South Macedonia. She speaks to the father of Livanás, and to his grandmother, the old Stavrianού Mourkákaina.

'Oh! my good Stavrianού,
That you may have joy of all
you love,

And you to my right, and my
left,

Let me too make my lament.
Three full years have passed
Since our good Venizélos,
Who is a great minister—
May he live, may his life be
long!—

Knew the secret,
And this year he told it.
Four kingdoms are allied,
To fight the Turk.
They have utterly conquered
And have crushed him.

Come near me, Livanás!
You who went there to the
spot,

Tell me what news you won.
Where are our sons?
Yesterday I was in my house,
And was dressing my chil-
dren,

For it was holiday and feast,
And Saint Spyridon's day,
When away there off Tæna-
ron

I saw our ships pass.
The lads shouted out,
That we should go to their
homes,

And say farewell for them,
For they go to Janina,
They go to fight,
And conquer the Turk,
And if they do not conquer
him,

They will never come back.

Χαιράμενί μου Σταυριανού,
ποῦ νὰ χαρῆς ὃ τι ἀγαπᾷς,

κι' ἀπὸ δεξιὰ κι' ἀπὸ ζερβιά,

μόνε καὶ μένα ἄφες μου.

Τρία χρονάκια κλειδωτά
ὁ Βενιζέλος ὁ καλός,
(ὁποῦ εἶναι μέγας ὑπουργός,
ὁποῦ νὰ ζῇ, νὰ 'χῇ ζωή)

ἐγνώριζε τὸ μυστικὸ
καὶ φέτου τὸ φανέρωσε.
Τέσσερα κράτη σύφωνα
τὸν Τοῦρκο πολεμήσασι·
ὅλα τότε νικήσασι
καὶ τὸν κατατροπώσασι.

Ἔλα κοντά μου, Λιβανᾶ,
ποῦ διάηκες ἐκεῖ κοντά.

Γιὰ πές μου τί καζάντησες;
ποῦ εἶναι τὰ παιδία μας;
Χτὲς ἤμουνα 'ς τὸ σπίτι μου,
κ' ἐντυνα τὰ παιδία μου,

τί τανε σκόλη καὶ γιορτή,
(ἦταν τ' ἁγίου Σπυρίδωνα)
κι' ἀπόξω ἀπὸ τὸ Ταίναρο

περνοῦσαν τὰ καράβια μας.
Φωνάζαν τὰ παιδία μας
νὰ ποῦμε χαιρετίσματα

ἐμεῖς εἰς τὰ σπιτάκια τους,
τί κείνα πᾶν 'ς τὰ Γιάννανα,
πάσι νὰ πολεμήσουσι,
τὸν Τοῦρκο νὰ νικήσουσι,
κι' ἂ δέν τоне νικήσουσι,

πίσου νὰ μὴ γυρίσουσι.

Come near me, Livanás !
 Is it not a shame
 And a great reproach,
 To weep for our children ?
 For Spartan women
 Do not weep for their sons,
 When they go and are slain,
 For the glory of their country.
 The good Venizélos,
 Who is our first minister,
 Sent a telegram
 To the lady Mavromichali.
 Her son had been killed,
 Who was an officer.
 And she sent him an answer
 "He has done his duty."
 That is our nature.
 As tradition tells us,
 Our folk have come from
 Sparta.
 Surely we have not become
 Vlachs,
 And never known it?
 Come near me, Livanás !
 You know it well,
 With what love I nursed him,
 And trained him to be a
 doctor,
 To make me a good old age.
 And now they have slain him
 for me,
 Away in Sarantáporon.
 Happy is his death,
 For it has freed a people.
 Is it the first time
 That there are deaths in
 Maina ?
 Surely they were slain
 In Crete, when they went
 There to the Klepht war,
 When they took them from
 among us,
 The leaders of the Bands ?
 How we longed for it !
 That a Mainiate should be
 Minister,

"Ελα κοντά μου, Λιβανᾶ.
 Δὲν τὸ θωροῦμε γιὰ κακὸ
 καὶ γιὰ μεγάλη προσβολὴ
 νὰ κλαῖμε τὰ παιδιὰ μας ;
 καὶ πῶς ; οἱ Σπαρτιάτισσαι
 δὲν κλαῖνε τὰ παιδιὰ τους,
 ὅταν πᾶν καὶ σκοτώνονται
 γιὰ τῆς πατρίδας τὸ καλὸ.
 Ὁ Βενιζέλος ὁ καλὸς
 (ὁποῦ εἶναι καὶ πρωθυπουργός)
 ἔκανε τηλεγράφημα
 εἰς τὴ Μανρομιχάλινα.
 σκοτώθη τὸ παιδάκι τῆς,
 ποῦ ἦτα κ' ἀξιωματικός·
 κ' ἐκείνη τοῦ ἀπάντησε·
 τὴ ἔκαμε τὸ καθήκο του.
 Μεῖς ἔχομε τὸ φυσικόν,
 ἀπ' ἀκοῇ κ' ἀγροικητά,
 ἀπὸ τῇ Σπάρτῃ ἤρθασι.
 Μὰ μήπως ἐβλαχέψαμε
 καὶ δὲν τὸ καταλάβαμε ;
 "Ελα κοντά μου, Λιβανᾶ.
 Ἐσὸ τὸ γινώριζες καλὰ,
 ὅτι τὸ χαζανιάστησα,
 καὶ τὸ ἐσπούδασα γιὰτρό,
 γιὰ τὰ καλὰ γεράματα,
 κ' ἀπὲξ μὲ τὸ σκοτώσασι,
 ἐκεῖ 'ς τὸ Σαραντάπορο.
 Χαλάλι του ὁ θάνατος,
 γιὰτὶ λευτέρωσε λαόν !
 Μήπως εἶν' πρώτη τους φορὰ
 'ς τῇ Μάνῃ τὰ σκοτώματα ;
 Τίγαρε δὲ σκοτώθηνα
 'ς τὴν Κρήτην, ὅταν πάνησσι
 ἐκεῖ 'ς τὸν κλεφτοπόλεμον ;
 ὅταν μᾶς τοῦζε παίρνασι
 ἐμᾶς οἱ κομματάρχηδες ;
 Τίγαρε δὲν τὸ θέλαμε
 νὰ ναι Μανιάτης ὑπουργός,

That he might do us honour,
That he might have con-
sideration

All of us in our homes.
The Cretan is good too.
He is a great man.

May they have a thousand
blessings,

All who voted for him,
And brought him here,
To make Hellas great.
Listen! Let me say to you
What the priest told me,
That our Venizélos
Has been called to go
To hold a council
In the capital of England.
Oh! Greek and Christian
women

At night before your lamp,
And where your ikon stands,
Summon your children
To make their prayer
To our Lady, the All-holy,
To send him strength,
And to Michael the Arch-
angel

To be near his side,
That They may not scoff at
us.

For They are powerful,
And They are very unjust.'

νὰ μᾶςε κἀνὴ τὸ καλὸ,
νὰ ῥωμε τὴν ὑπόληψη

ὅλοι μέσα ῥτὰ σπίτια μας ;
Καλὸς εἶναι κι' ὁ Κρητικὸς,
εἶναι μεγάλος ἄνθρωπος.
Χίλια καλὰ νὰ κάμουνσι

ὅσοι τόνε ψηφίσασι
καὶ τόνε φέρασι ἐπὰ,
νὰ μεγαλώσῃ τὴν Ἑλλάδα.

Ἀκούσατε νὰ σᾶρε ποῦ
τοῦτο, ποῦ μοῦ εἶπε ὁ παπᾶς'
ὅτι τὸ Βενιζέλο μας
τόνε καλέσασι νὰ πᾶ,
νὰ κάμῃ τὴ γεροντικὴ
ῥ τὴν ἀγγλικὴ πρωτεύουσα.
Μωρὴ ῥωμαῖς καὶ Χριστιαναῖς,

τὸ βράδν ῥτὸ λυχνάρι σας
καὶ ῥ τὸ κονισματάκι σας
νὰ βάλτε τὰ παιδία σας
νὰ κάμουνσι τὴν προσευχὴ
ῥ τὴν Παναγία Δέσποινα,
γιά νὰ τοῦ στείλῃ δύναμη.
κι' ὁ Μιχαὴλ ἀρχάγγελος

νὰ ναι κοντὰ ῥ τὴν πλάτη του,
νὰ μὴ μᾶς τὸν γελάσουνσι

τὶ κἄννοι εἶναι ἰσχυροὶ
καὶ εἶναι κι' ἄδικοι πολὺ.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

Art. 11.—THE DEVASTATION OF MACEDONIA. ✓

1. *Atrocités Grecques en Macédoine pendant la guerre Greco-Bulgare (Avec une carte et 53 reproductions photographiques)*. Par Prof. Dr L. Miletitch. Sophia : Imprimerie de l'état, 1913.
2. *Réponse à la brochure des Professeurs des Universités d'Athènes, 'Atrocités Bulgares en Macédoine.'* Par les professeurs de l'Université de Sophia. Sophia : Imprimerie de la Cour Royale, 1913.
3. *Extraits fac-similés de certaines lettres trouvées dans le courrier du 19me régiment de la 7me division grecque, saisi par les troupes bulgares dans la region Razlog, le 14/27 Juillet, 1913.* Sofia : Imprimerie de la Cour Royale, 1913.
4. *Nouvelle Série de Lettres écrites. . . par des soldats grecques du 19me régiment, 7me division. . . Témoignages des citoyens paisibles de Serrès, victimes des atrocités grecques et sauvés par miracle.* Sofia, 1/14 Sept. 1913.

THE question of culpability for the atrocities committed in the second Balkan War has already been much debated, but such information as has been published has come chiefly from the Greeks. The Carnegie Commission has taken much evidence, and its report is eagerly awaited; but, as the date of its appearance is not yet known, it seems desirable to publish some testimonies collected from other than Greek sources. We may surely rely upon the English public to hold an even balance while the question is in dispute.

I ask the reader to compare the conditions of the civil populations of Eastern Macedonia (now New Greece) as they were last June with what they are to-day, and to put it to himself upon whom the responsibility must rest for a tragedy so vast, grim and atrocious. This area, though one of the most fruitful and beautiful in Europe, and the seat of an ancient civilisation, is little known to Englishmen. It has been vilely misgoverned for five centuries. Since 1887 it has been the cockpit of rival sectaries, Patriarchist Greeks and Bulgarian Exarchists. During the first War (1912) Thrace and Eastern Macedonia were traversed by a Turkish army in retreat and by

the Bulgarians, but suffered surprisingly little, and at the end of last June, after six months of Bulgarian rule, was in a good way. The conquerors had paid for what they took; discipline was rigid; no looting was allowed. What local friction had occurred was due to fanatical Greek ecclesiastics; and, although actual skirmishes had taken place at Pangaion and Nigrita, these were in consequence of Greek troops intruding upon districts under Bulgarian administration. The fact stands that, when I left Adrianople in mid-April, 1913, nobody was saying that any man of any race or religion in Eastern Macedonia was being oppressed by his Bulgarian rulers in mind, body or estate.*

What was this population like? It was not homogeneous; its most important city, Salonika, was, and is still, a predominantly Hebrew community, speaking the Old Spanish its ancestors brought with them from Castile. The Chalkidic Peninsula, the coastline, and the trading communities in the towns were Greek, while the agricultural population, solidly Bulgarian in the northern half of the territory, was largely so to within a few miles of the Ægean Sea. There were considerable Turkish districts and smaller settlements of Kutzo-Vlachs and Gypsies; but, local admixture notwithstanding, the country between the Rhodope Mountains and the sea, known from time immemorial as Macedonia, was down to last June populated by Macedonians, i.e. Bulgarians speaking the Bulgarian tongue, and worshipping according to the rites of the Bulgarian (Exarchist) Church. These men and women were consciously and ardently attached to their Bulgarian brothers of the Kingdom. To regard these people as savages, and their destruction as negligible, is to be guilty of inexcusable ignorance. They were a

* I spent five months in the Balkans and Adrianople in the winter of 1912-13, distributing relief on behalf of the Society of Friends' War Victims Fund. As to the general good behaviour of the Bulgarians during and after the first war I rely on the evidence of my own senses. With regard to the way in which the Bulgarians treated the Greeks of Thrace during the six months of their ascendancy there, I may cite the evidence of my friend Mr Stephen Hobhouse, of Castile Cary. The Greek women admitted to him that they hated the Bulgars, but they had 'treated them like gentlemen.'

courteous, industrious and virile race living upon their own properties, producing large quantities of wine, silk, cotton, leather, tobacco, rice and other foodstuffs. Despite much discouragement from their Turkish masters they had educated themselves. In the majority of villages, and in all towns where there was any considerable Bulgarian population, the white school-house was a conspicuous object, and the school-teacher a leading man. Such were the Bulgarians of Eastern Macedonia in the last days of June, 1913.

Where are they to-day? Gone! They have disappeared. So far as human agency can effect it, they have been obliterated. By shot, shell and bayonet, by fire and torture, by proscription, imprisonment and forcible exile, the whole non-Greek element has been destroyed or chased out. The reader will please to observe that I am not yet saying by whom this thing has been done, but stating the well-ascertained fact that someone has done it. Nor have destruction and proscription stopped at Bulgarians. Roman Catholics* and Protestants and a mixed multitude of Turks, Kutzovlachs and Jews,† have been impartially maltreated, robbed and expelled at the point of the bayonet. Whither? Into Bulgaria—a point which will call for later consideration. At the present moment more than one hundred villages and several towns, which in June last were as peaceful and as prosperous as any in the Balkans, and in point of good order and education would have compared favourably with a similar number in the Kingdom of Greece, lie wasted, roofless and without inhabitant. This devastation, by whomsoever effected, was done during or immediately after harvest, and with extreme severity. It appears that it was no part of the

* So asserted by their Bishop at the time and *on the spot*, but subsequently denied by him at Salonika. The denial, if genuine, was undoubtedly extorted by Greek pressure; but the Bishop's signature, like that of Mr Haskell, to be mentioned later, was most probably forged. The outrages and murders are well attested by other witnesses.

† Who ever heard of a Jew being maltreated by a Bulgarian? The idea is ludicrous. In Bulgaria, and in practically no other Christian community in eastern Europe, the Hebrew votes, travels, owns land, serves in the army, holds his head erect and enjoys every right of full citizenship. Yet the spoliation and murder of Jews in Eastern Macedonia is laid to the charge of the one race notoriously incapable of such conduct.

destroyers' plan that the population should escape. Efforts were made to intercept escape, in many cases successful efforts. Those who saved themselves (and many thousands did not) fled at a moment's notice, carrying children upon their backs, and dragging others by the hand. These fugitives, two-thirds of whom were women, were questioned by Englishmen and Americans as they entered Bulgarian territory. Most of them brought away nothing but the working summer clothes in which they stood at the moment; and in these thin garments, long since reduced to filthy rags, an enormous number are at this hour enduring the rigours of a North-Bulgarian winter. I believe that of the approximately 130,000 refugees who are now King Ferdinand's guests, and fed by his bounty, there are about 100,000 whose homes were in what is now New Greece.

These are the admitted facts upon which I ask judgment. Neither Greek nor Bulgar denies that New Greece lies waste, or that this abominable and wholesale ruin was wrought within the space of about four weeks. Who did it? and why? The Greeks lay it at the door of the Bulgarians; these accuse the Greeks.

First let us decide whether it was an act of war and can be defended as such. A hard-pressed force may plead justification for setting fire to the villages and towns through which it retreats. Nothing delays pursuit like this. The beaten Turks wasted Thrace as they fell back from Losengrad to Lulu Burgas. The 'Times' war-correspondent held that ninety per cent. of the destruction visible south of Adrianople was their doing. The Bulgarians have never claimed this excuse for what they did or did not do. In the first place their retreat from Kilkis (Kukush) to the mountains was a leisurely movement. They covered about six-and-a-quarter miles a day, and except for a few hours on one day were never pressed; they had therefore no need to destroy the country behind them. They deny having done so; it belonged to their own people; nor will they admit for a moment having perpetrated massacres and compelled wholesale emigrations. Nor do the refugees accuse them; with one voice they accuse the Greeks. Is it reasonable to suppose that from party feeling, or any other conceivable impulse, an enormous multitude of

women and children, without means of collusion and isolated in widely-separated harbours of refuge, should all invent and adhere to the same mendacity?

Observe, too, the circumstances under which their stories were first told. The depositions of very many were taken (for the most part at various points along the frontier, and before they had any opportunity of contact with Bulgarian officials, or others) by impartial foreigners,* whose good faith cannot be doubted, who speak Bulgarian, questioned the refugees directly without the aid of interpreters, and took notes in common. It is no secret in Bulgaria that an enquiry was made on behalf of the British Legation at Sofia; and I have reason to believe that the information then collected has been officially forwarded to the Foreign Office. Similar stories were told to my personal friend Mr Mattheeff when the poor wretches reached Sofia, and to Dr O'Leary and Mr Frater of the English Balkan Relief Fund; also to my friend Mr L. D. Woodruff of the American Mission, and to Prof. W. S. Monro (of Montclair, N.J.), whose letter lies before me. General Miles and his son Lieut. Miles, of the United States Legation in Sofia, also interviewed fugitives and heard similar reports. Lieut. Miles and Prof. Monro succeeded in penetrating into the theatre of war and gained their impressions upon the spot. All these gentlemen, whom I may call the Anglo-American witnesses, collected evidence at different points at different times, yet it all agrees. Testimony tendered by such persons, and upon such a scale, would convince any jury in the world.

There are also contributory pieces of evidence to prove this. After the entrapped Greek force was let out of the Krestna defile at the armistice, it retreated southward, burning many villages which had escaped the ravages of the war. The city of Stroumitza was occupied by the Greeks from the date of the armistice until the conclusion of peace. It may be supposed that King Constantine expected this place would be adjudged to him. It was awarded to King Ferdinand; so before evacuating it the

* The names of these gentlemen have been laid before me and, if published, would at once silence suspicion, but for various reasons it is not desirable to divulge them.—EDITOR.

Greeks burnt it and blew up the bridge. And this was done in time of peace.

But enough as to burnt towns; there is worse to come. A prodigious and horrible loss of civilian lives has to be accounted for; men, women, and small children were put to death, many of them with circumstances of horrid barbarity. Evidence in my possession shows that some of the children were eviscerated; others had their legs cut off; others were cut across the hands, etc. And again one is faced with a direct conflict of testimony. As usual, the Greek story was first given to the world. During the whole of July Bulgaria was as completely out of touch with the rest of the world as some mid-Pacific isle. But from July 2 the Greeks kept their organs in western Europe supplied with letters and photographs so destructive to the moral character of their enemies that all sympathy for Bulgaria either died outright, or suffered a shock from which it is but slowly and partially recovering as the truth filters through.

The thing was well stage-managed. King Constantine the Bulgar-Killer* took the field with an address to his army which in form and substance was a cry for vengeance upon the Bulgarians for their (alleged) atrocities. In a despatch addressed to the Greek Legations in the capitals of Europe he threatened reprisals, and authorised his ministers to make his intentions known. During the month of fighting the animosity of his troops was kept at fever-heat by the belief that the populations of certain Greek towns named had been subjected to pillage, outrage and massacre. References to these (supposed) atrocities occur in the 'Intercepted Greek Letters,'† whose writers plainly felt they were

* So styled in the inscription upon the triumphal arch erected to greet his Majesty on his return to Salonika. 'Boulgaroktonos' is good; it revives in his honour one of the least savoury cognomens of early Byzantine history. The title was given to the Emperor Basil II, who put out the eyes of 15,000 Bulgarian prisoners.

† These letters were found in a Greek mail-cart captured by the Bulgarians at Dobrinishti in the district of Razlog on July 14/27, 1913. They were brought to Sofia, and were shown *at once* to foreign experts who pronounced them genuine. No forger could have fabricated such a number of letters in the time. They were written by soldiers of the 19th regiment (7th Division) of the Greek army. I have myself seen some of the originals. The hand-writings vary widely, some being those of educated

justified in repaying injuries in kind, and refer their acknowledged acts of incendiarism and massacre to superior orders, royal orders, etc.

His Majesty took Europe into his confidence. In a telegram addressed to the 'Daily Mail,' reproduced in 'Le Temps' of July 4, he accused the Bulgarian army of 'respecting neither the goods, lives, nor honour' of the Greek populations of four villages (named) and of having 'massacred old men, women and children.' King Ferdinand replied to this charge by showing, from the dates, that this letter was prepared and despatched before the outbreak of war, and whilst the villages concerned were miles in the rear of the Bulgarian lines, and wholly outside the royal author's range of vision; also that they were Bulgarian villages, not in the least likely to have suffered from the cruelty of their friends. The same accusation is made as to Bulgarians sacking and burning towns, such as Kukulush, which had not a single Greek resident, and whose flying crowds of women were deliberately shelled by Greek batteries, not accidentally but with cruel glee, as one of the Intercepted Letters shows.

How then shall I treat the mass of evidence which encumbers my desk? How make selection from Bulgarian official publications, private memoranda placed at my disposal, notes of conversations with eye-witnesses, letters from personal friends? I cannot deal with one per cent. of it. The merest catalogue of villages sacked and burnt, men flogged to death, women raped and mothers ripped, wounded slaughtered in hospital, prisoners of war tied to trees with telegraph-wire and burnt alive, or buried to the neck and left, would occupy a score of pages. The advance of the Greek army has been held up to the admiration of military men as a miracle of speed.* Its slowness is the fact which calls

men, others of uneducated. The paper used is of many kinds—telegraph forms, bill-heads of some Moslem shop-keeper in the south, the insides of tradesmen's envelopes from villages on the route from Salonica, printed forms taken from Bulgarian government offices, etc. Two brochures of facsimiles have been published by the Bulgarian Government, and can be obtained from the writer of this article. See further below (p. 523).

* By Capt. Trapmann in the 'Nineteenth Century,' Oct. 1913. This writer is under the misapprehension that the Bulgarians heavily outnumbered the Greeks, and that the latter 'practically wiped out' about

for explanation; two furlongs per hour is no Marathon Race, but it is all King Constantine was able to exact from a force outnumbering its opponents by four or five to one.* Why? Because his gallant boys had something else to do. From almost the first contact with the enemy, desertion became epidemic. The Greek, making away with his uniform, donned clothes looted from countrymen,† and forwent the joy of battle and the crowded hour of glorious life to revert to his congenial, and shall we say ancestral, calling of thief. Regiments depleted, or encumbered with heterogeneous loot, make slow marchers and timid fighters. What went on behind the line of Greek advance no pen may tell. The maltreatment of Bulgarian women seems to have been a speciality of these dastards, who during their month of 'fighting' could never, as General Ivanoff assures me, be got to charge with the bayonet.

Out of hundreds of reported atrocities, the cases of Doxato and Serres emerge somewhat saliently, not that they were worse than others, but that around them a legend has been woven damaging to Bulgaria until dissipated. In one case the legend rests upon the word of an English witness, a gentleman who was personally conducted to the spot, shown over the ruins, and told what it was desired he should believe, and whose letter appeared in the 'Nation,' August 23. Doxato was a little town in southern Macedonia, half Turk, half Greek, with only ten Bulgarian households. From December to June it had been governed by King Ferdinand's officials, not without difficulty on account of the fanaticism of its Patriarchist Bishop and his flock. When at the outbreak of the second war the strong, impartial hand of authority was relaxed, the local Greeks established a reign of

five times as many Bulgarians as General Ivanoff commanded! In the Dec. issue of the 'Nineteenth Century' I examined his statements.

* The Greeks had over 120,000 men; the Bulgarian force opposing them numbered only 36,000, a large proportion of whom were recently raised Macedonian levies. It was notoriously deficient in artillery and ammunition, with both of which the Greeks were well supplied.

† This is not hypothetical. The exchanging of clothing was watched and deposed to by eye-witnesses; as were the labours of the photographic corps which accompanied King Constantine's forces, who were observed stripping and redressing the still supple corpses and grouping them artistically before their cameras.

terror, locked their handful of Bulgar neighbours into their schoolhouse and set it on fire over their heads before falling upon the Turks. A Bulgarian cavalry patrol came up in time to release the prisoners and check the mischief. Many Greeks fled. The exasperated Turks commenced reprisals, and two had to be executed before order could be re-established. Then the approach of a strong Greek force was signalled; and the Bulgarians retired, seeing later from afar the town burning. As a matter of fact the advancing Greeks did not come up until next day, and then too late to save their countrymen, who in the interval had been massacred by the Turks. This is according to the depositions of the two Bulgarian officers in command of the squadron, which I have in my hands. Commander Cardale, an Englishman in the Greek service, the witness referred to above, was told that the appalling spectacle was the work of Bulgarians, or of Turks serving under Bulgarian officers. As to the truth of this he expresses no opinion. He sets down what he heard from his guides, who do not appear to have been present at the killing, but remarks that, whereas the Greek houses were in ruins, the Turkish dwellings were practically intact but without inhabitant, and had plainly been the scenes of hideous butcheries. One leading Turk was reported to have decoyed 120 of his Greek neighbours into his premises under promise of protection and murdered them. The incident has precedents and may have been true. After sifting the evidence it seems obvious to me that, after the Bulgarian force retired, no Bulgarian officers could possibly have remained behind (as Commander Cardale was told) to direct the movements of the Turks, since the latter would certainly have taken vengeance upon them for the execution of their comrades by the Bulgarian patrol. Moreover, everything that the commander records of his own seeing is consistent with the account given by the two Bulgarian witnesses, both (I am told) holding commissions in King Ferdinand's guards.

I pass on to Serres, which is, or was, a prosperous little town in southern Macedonia, with Greek, Hebrew and Bulgarian inhabitants. Like Doxato, it had enjoyed just and equal rule for three months under Bulgarian governors, who evacuated the city on June 22. During

the following week the local Greeks took arms and summoned their Bulgarian fellow-townsmen of both sexes, to the number of two hundred, into the presence of the Greek Archbishop. In the girls' seminary adjoining the palace they were addressed by this prelate, segregated into different small classrooms and massacred with knives and sabres. Seven miserably-wounded creatures crawled from beneath the heaps of dead on the night following. They eventually reached Sofia and the evidence of five of them is cited by Prof. Miletitch, and has, I believe, been taken by the Carnegie Commissioners. There is some evidence that the Archbishop was cognisant of the atrocity and did not interpose to prevent it. In Serres, as at Doxato and elsewhere, the corpses were exhibited and photographed as Greek victims of Bulgarian ferocity. Two French newspapers, 'Le Temps' and 'L'Illustration,' lent their pages to these misrepresentations. 'Le Temps' reported the burial with military honours by the Greek forces of the mutilated corpses of the Bishop of Doiran and the Archbishop of Serres, said to have been cruelly done to death by Bulgarians. A mummery of this kind really took place for the benefit of foreign correspondents. Both the ecclesiastics referred to were alive and well in September.

'L'Illustration' reproduced a photograph of a heap of bodies in Greek costumes, piled around a stake upon which hung a body attired in the vestments of a Patriarchist pope. I had early news of the preparation of this imposture. Every corpse was that of a murdered Bulgar, stripped and reclothed as a Greek. The story was mailed out to the United States; but, as it was felt that the name of an honest man was needed to carry the fraud through, such a name was obtained in the following way. The Rev. E. B. Haskell, an American Protestant missionary in Salonika, was induced to sign a petition for relief for the refugees, after which his signature was adroitly copied and appended to an admission that he had been an eye-witness of the Bulgarian atrocities at Serres. The document thus attested was sent to, and appeared in, the columns of the New York 'Christian Herald.' The fraud was exposed by my friend the Rev. Mr Hollwey of Sofia, an American. At Bucarest these

and other 'fake' atrocities were tabled by the Greek delegate as reasons for ceding to King Constantine territories defiled by foes obviously incapable of civilised rule.

M. René Puaux, correspondent of 'Le Temps,' sent news which appeared in the issue of that paper on July 13, saying that he had been present at the interment of the Greek Archbishop of Serres, whose corpse, with those of many other notables who had been taken as hostages by the Bulgarians, had been found in a cart. He added that the sight was the most revolting that he had ever seen; that the body of the Archbishop had been disfigured, nose, ears, etc., cut off. In point of fact this miserable remnant of humanity was the corpse of poor Dimitri Gheorghieff, the Bulgarian priest of Krushevo, cruelly killed by Greeks. The body, dressed up after death in the vestments of an Archbishop, was put into a cart and exhibited to M. René Puaux. Here again, although the victims were Bulgars, their deaths are laid by the Greeks at the door of the Bulgarian General Vulkoff, who was more than 150 kilometres away at the time.

The following is a literal translation of information supplied in French:

'On June 27 (1913) the Greek telegraphic agency informed the world that the Bulgarians, whilst retreating from Doïran, had carried off with them the Archbishop (Metropolitan) Photios and had killed him, and that the Patriarch of Constantinople had celebrated a requiem mass for the prelate. The world was astounded (*ébranlé*) by the news, which was systematically propagated. The facts are that Photios, arrested as a spy, with letters for the Greek general upon him, had been interned at the monastery of Tétévé, and was safe and sound. Shortly afterwards he reached Constantinople, a free man enjoying excellent health. . . .

'The massacre of the Bulgarian population at Kilkis (Kukush) by the Greeks was represented by them and their correspondents as being the work of Bulgarians. The corpses of Bulgarians killed by the Greeks, gathered from among the ruins, were photographed, and the photographs were sent to illustrated papers ("L'Illustration," of Paris, and "The Sphere," of London), with the title "Greeks killed by Bulgarians." Thus at Akandjali more than 400 corpses of

women, children and old men massacred by Greeks were represented as victims of the Bulgarians. . . .

'At Nigrita 1200 Bulgarian soldiers, taken prisoners at the battle of Lahna, were exterminated by the Greek soldiers, as avowed by the Greek letters we have seized. The bodies were shown to correspondents as those of villagers killed by the Bulgarians; and, lest the witnesses should detect fraud, they had been stripped of their uniforms.'

Lying before me are twenty-seven manuscript depositions taken down from the lips of fugitives by an English friend conversant with Greek and Bulgarian. Mito Koloff, a boy of 14, shows a sabre-cut across his hand, and a bullet-wound in his side; he was running beside his mother; Greek cavalymen killed her and wounded him. Another boy was cut down; also an old woman. The witness lay still and watched them burn his village. He crept away that night. (One observes that many refugees show hands mangled by sword-cuts received whilst holding them up to entreat mercy.) Selecting at random, I find Peter Gheorghieff of Survelo, near Doiran, deposes that he saw eight villages (named) burnt by the Greeks on June 24 (o.s.). The population of the whole countryside to the number of 3000 assembled at Borislaff. The Greek cavalry arrived first and searched all the houses for arms. Then all the money was demanded and taken. On Sunday evening they began violating the women, and next morning started firing upon the people and massacred them, with the help of local Turks whom they had armed. The village was surrounded by Greeks, who prevented anyone from escaping. The witness was saved by being used as a guide. Christo Zankoff saw a man (named) and five women and a child (also named) cut down by cavalry whilst running away. Two witnesses, Roman Catholics of position, and of education which enabled them to save themselves by claiming to be correspondents of French newspapers, relate the shelling, burning and ravaging of Kukush. The witnesses, in their assumed character of correspondents, were treated with great attention by the Greek authorities and the Greek Archbishop of Serres, who furnished them with two bandits as an escort. They were taken round to several Bulgarian villages

with which they were already familiar, and were shown piles of slaughtered peasants, who were represented to them as Greeks killed by the Bulgarians.

I took down the following particulars of the sack of Bulgarkeui from the lips of Dr O'Leary (M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P. of London) and Mr Frater, gentlemen who have spent fourteen months in the Balkans and who speak the language. The doctor served in the English unit of the Red Cross hospital at Losengrad, where my friend Dr Count acted as his assistant. He came to me with an introduction from my friend Mr Delmard of Sofia. Since the close of the first war both gentlemen have worked under Mr Noel Buxton at relief work among the fugitives. Bulgarkeui last June was a pretty village near Kichan. As its name implies, it was a Bulgarian settlement in a Turkish or Græco-Turkish district. On St Peter's day the place was surrounded by Greek regular soldiery who had made temporary alliance with the local Turks. The party was joined by civilian Greeks. The men were first collected, roped together in batches, drenched with oil and set on fire. Some were shot as they ran for the oak-scrub, others pursued and killed there, as will appear later. The prettiest young women were reserved. Several of these, whose names were given to the doctor, were apparently used as baits to attract their lovers, husbands and brothers. There are in most Christian villages secret hiding-places built as retreats in case of a Turkish attack. These are frequently alluded to in the depositions of other witnesses as to other massacres. It would seem that some men had concealed themselves in such places at Bulgarkeui. When, attracted by the shrieks, the men showed themselves, some were shot off-hand, others tied to trees and compelled to watch the violation of their women. This business over, the men were shot in the presence of the girls, who were killed last.

The reader will not improbably turn the page and dismiss this horror from his mind as a thing incredible, and wholly incapable of verification, the pitiful revenge of bereaved women, pouring their impotent hatred into alien and credulous ears. But, to such doubters I submit that this story was first told to my informants in Varna by a party of women who believed themselves to be the

sole survivors of the massacre, subsequently by a similar party in Bourgas, and later still by a third party in Haskovo. The joy of these poor creatures at learning of the survival of some of their friends was wholly unrehearsed. Collusion was absolutely unthinkable. The towns mentioned are long distances apart; Haskovo is two days' travelling from Bourgas, three from Varna. The scattering of the fugitives, and their adoption of divergent lines of flight through the oak-scrub, is quite explicable. Their stories agreed in every important detail. Asked how they knew that Greek regular * troops were present, they correctly described the round caps and plain, unnumbered shoulder-straps of their assailants. Supplementing these three accounts (surely sufficient in themselves to carry conviction) came the story of the schoolmaster of the same village. He, hidden in his private priest-hole, had witnessed the outraging, tortures and final murders. Escaping after dark to the bush, he wandered alone and hungry for three days, and found in a clearing a heap of dead, around which were creeping five emaciated wretches, three men and two women, whose eyes had been picked out. They had starved there in agony and darkness since the day of horror, and piteously besought their friend to cut their throats. 'My knife was small and blunt,' said he to Dr O'Leary, 'I did my best for them.'

At Varna Doctor O'Leary and Mr Frater, as agents for Mr Noel Buxton, M.P. and others, met the ship which brought back nearly 1300 prisoners of war from Greece. Many of these had been civilian residents at Salonika—officials, merchants, professional men of position, now ruined exiles, accused of no crime but their Bulgarian nationality. They had been detained three months after

* This appears to be incredible, as there is no official record of any part of the Greek army having crossed the Maritza, although it is claimed that Greek cavalry patrols got as far as the valley of that river before the occupation of Dedeagatch. It must be remembered, however, that bands of *andartes*, who may have worn the uniforms of the regulars, or have even been composed of deserters who preferred plundering on their own account to campaigning with King Constantine's army in Macedonia, operated in the name of the 'Autonomous Government of Gumuldjina.' Other bands of Kurds, Lazes, and Greeks are known to have operated in Turkish Thrace, where, on occasion, the scattered Armenian residents were massacred in default of Bulgarians.

the final signature of peace, and had been grudgingly released, being offered passports to any country except Bulgaria. With difficulty and delay they had reached home at last, but in what condition? Six hundred were suffering from scurvy, some with spongy gums and purple-blotched faces. Thirty-six were dying on deck; five had succumbed during the voyage. They had been driven on board the steamer 'Ekaterini' at Salonika on June 19 (o.s.) and carried to Ithacou. Soon after starting, the Bulgarian Archimandrite Eulogius, one of the prisoners, was struck by a Greek soldier and ordered upon deck. Shots were heard, a cry, a splash alongside, and presently a sailor came down and remarked 'I shot your bishop. Was there any harm in it?''* On reaching their island prison they were robbed of their coats and all useful clothing, watches, purses, etc. The rations supplied were bread in insufficient quantity, and meat, frequently uneatable, the latter at fortnightly intervals. Their guards robbed them of their food. No medical attendance was provided, and any unusual symptoms of sickness threw their jailers into a condition of panic terror resulting in fiendish cruelty. One wretch showed Dr O'Leary his head and hands seared with fire, one eye destroyed. He, and seven others, suspected of cholera, had been flung into a pit, with brushwood piled upon them, the whole sprinkled with paraffine and set on fire. Attempts to climb out of this fiery tomb were repelled with bullets. He alone escaped.

Shall we be told that these misérables were romancing, that their scurvy and their scars were simulated, and that what happened was the proper penalty of their wilful determination to return to Bulgaria months after the signing of peace? Nor are the artless revelations of the two series of captured Letters to be swept aside as forgeries. It is the deliberate opinion of British and American gentlemen, such as Prof. Rendel Harris and Mr Thomas Whittemore, who are versed in modern

* An independent version of this murder appears in the Bulgarian official publication entitled 'Réponse,' p. 110. Garde-Forestier Basil Lazaroff, a prisoner of war on the same ship, relates his experience, which is practically identical with that given to Dr O'Leary. The secretary of the Archimandrite met with the same fate, and both were fired on while struggling in the water.

Greek and accustomed to handle documentary evidence, that they are beyond question genuine. Mr T. Whittemore testifies that after examining between 200 and 300 of these letters at the Foreign Office, Sofia, 'the allegation of forgery is absolutely dispelled by the letters themselves.' He comments upon those addressed to American friends in Milwaukee, New York City, and other places; also upon the extraordinary variety of paper used, and the field-post marks; and he is fully convinced. But, assuming for a moment that the whole batch of letters, amounting to hundreds, was the manufacture of hired scribes in Sofia, how came they by the names and pet-names of the authors, the addresses to which they were to be delivered, many in America, in Alexandria, in Cairo, as well as scores in Athens? Do these persons and addresses exist, or are they imaginary? Nobody has yet asserted the latter, I believe; and, if the persons to whom the letters are addressed are realities, how should hireling scribblers in Sofia know of them and of their whereabouts, and of the existence of their friends in the Greek army, their names, ranks and regiments?

What emerges plainly from this mass of evidence is a systematic plan. The Greek method was to send ahead of their army seeming-friendly emissaries, often wearing Bulgarian dress, who warn the country-people to remain in their villages. Next day the cavalry arrive; a cordon is drawn around the doomed hamlet or town; the men are summoned to surrender their arms, then rounded up and shot; search for money and valuables follows; then the pillagers give themselves up to an orgy of rape. Last comes an indiscriminate killing of women, children and elders. This was common form, not in one valley, or in the path of this or that regiment, but over the entire area of the war from a little north of Salonika to Petrich on the Bulgarian march. It was extended to districts outside the line of fighting. It was meted out to non-Bulgarian races. The Kutzo-Vlachs are a docile, wooden-faced, slow-spoken breed, hereditary herdsmen, and of no particular politics. But they are not Greeks! These thrifty, harmless folk were scattered sporadically in groups of little hamlets among the mountains. Uproot

them! burn! kill! was the word; and whole settlements were obliterated with torch and sabre. Four villages at Oshen and Oshani went up in flame; the smoke of their burning was visible for many a mile, and was testified to by Bulgarians of another valley. The survivors tell of returning next day to find wife, child, stock and cottage lost, gone, or destroyed.

All sheer inventions, say the Greeks in our press. To which I reply, let the Carnegie Commissioners decide. These gentlemen, Messrs Brailsford and Miliukoff, gave King Constantine his opportunity. Accepting their commission upon the demand of King Ferdinand, they first visited Salonika and desired facilities to visit, inspect and take evidence. But this King Constantine the Bulgar-Killer would not hear of. In a Note to the Powers dated July 19, His Majesty professed to desire a Commission of Enquiry constituted upon the spot 'to determine if one single Bulgarian had been tortured by Greek soldiers.' The Commissioners arrived, and were ill received and peremptorily warned-off. Nor is this the only occasion on which enquiry was burked or refused. The 'Times' correspondent in the Balkans, a gentleman resident there for over a quarter of a century, published last year a series of articles on the war. His fourth article appeared in the issue of Dec. 9. In it he referred briefly to the charges against the Greek army contained in his telegram from Rilo which appeared in the 'Times' of Aug. 7. To this telegram H.M. King Constantine sent a sweeping denial, which was published in that paper about a week later. To this the correspondent replied ('Times,' Aug. 21) offering, if H.M. desired it, to publish the evidence of the refugees upon which the original telegram was based. His Majesty failed to respond to this challenge, nor was any allusion to it permitted to appear in the Greek press.

For reasons undisclosed, New Greece was not in a condition to be inspected. But the Commissioners were welcomed at Sofia; every means of collecting information was placed at their disposal; and King Ferdinand and his people await their report with impatience. Almost the only man of British stock, Prof. W. S. Monro, an American, who has been able to penetrate the cordon and see with his own eyes the state of things, avers in a

letter now before me, that 'the Greek atrocities have been something appalling. The Bulgars have been horribly maligned by the English and American press,' etc.

Such were the methods; what was the object? The extermination of the non-Hellenic elements in the population of New Greece. In certain instances this object was fully attained. In preparing the lists of voters for the recent elections, the Bulgarian authorities found that from some of the villages all the males had disappeared except some old men and children. The aim is openly avowed in the Intercepted Letters, from which we take the following as typical examples. Pericles Soumbilis writes to his father G. P. Soumbilis, Megali Anastasova, Alagonia, Calamas: 'We have taken no prisoners, for such are our orders. Everywhere we burn the Bulgarian villages, so that that dirty race may never be able to recover itself. I embrace you, etc.' 'By order of the King, we set on fire all the Bulgarian villages.' 'We burn all the villages here and kill the Bulgarians, women and children.' 'Our orders are to burn the villages and massacre the young, sparing only the old men and children.' 'What we are doing to the Bulgarians is indescribable, as also to the Bulgarian villages—a butchery—there is not a Bulgarian town or village which has not been burnt.' 'Need I tell you, brother, that all the Bulgarians we take—and there are a good many—are put to death?' 'Of the 1200 prisoners we took at Nigrita only forty-one remain in the prisons, and wherever we have passed we have left no root of this race.' 'We burn all the Bulgarian villages that we occupy and kill all the Bulgarians who fall into our hands.' 'Not a cat escapes us.' 'We shoot them like sparrows.' But enough of these horrors. Inaugurated with a shriek for vengeance, the brief campaign was a pandemonium of lust, loot and blood, deliberately organised for political ends.

King Constantine had a singular opportunity of proving to Europe the capacity, civilisation and magnanimity of himself and his people. He preferred to play the rôle of Tamerlane; he has made a desert and calls it 'Greece.'

H. M. WALLIS.

Art. 12.—THE FUTURE OF RHODESIA. ✓

I.—FOR THE CHARTER.

IN considering the question of Chartered Company Rule in Rhodesia, it will save time and simplify argument if we assume certain grounds as common—that Cecil Rhodes was a patriot who desired to strengthen and extend the British Empire; that his main object in securing the North was to redress the balance of South Africa and make it predominantly British; that both the Cape Colony and the Imperial Government refused to undertake the work of occupying and administering the country; that there was imminent danger of an occupation either by the Transvaal Boers or by Germany when Rhodes intervened; that his device of rule by Chartered Company was the only practical course left to him; that Joint Stock Companies, however anomalous the practice may seem to be, have, as a matter of fact, acquired, civilised and administered a large part of the British Empire; and that in the present case of Rhodesia the British South Africa Company have acquired, settled and governed a very great territory, and in a space of twenty-five years brought it into the condition of a prosperous self-governing State under the British flag. I also take it as admitted that in this work they have received no financial or other assistance from the Imperial Government. And lastly, I take it as common ground that the shareholders, mainly British, who at the beginning numbered 16,000 and now number upwards of 40,000, and whose capital, originally a million sterling, had by 1912 increased to nine millions sterling, have never drawn a single dividend.

This point I dwell upon for a moment as important. The shareholders, who are at present more numerous than the colonists, naturally looked—and still look—for some return upon their money. While the colonists, who number about thirty thousand, sometimes rage against the Company for considering the interests of Throgmorton Street, the shareholders can point to the millions which have been expended on the development of the country and for the benefit of the settlers, without a return, so far, of a single penny in the shape of profit.

The shareholders have loyally supported the colonists through a series of misfortunes that might have been expected to sink any enterprise and ruin any struggling colony—the Matabele War, the Jameson Raid, Rinderpest, the Matabele and Mashonaland Rebellions, the South African War, and the East Coast Fever. These great calamities tested the heroism and proved the grit of the settlers; but they also tested the grit, and I might almost add the heroism of the shareholders, who loyally supported the Directors through all these trying times with fresh capital given without complaint.

And there is one other position which I take as granted by both sides. Rhodes obtained the concessions by which settlement was permitted; the Company which held these concessions placed the settlers in the country, financed and organised the march of the pioneers, provided arms and police to protect them against the natives, connected them with civilisation, gave them grants of land, guaranteed their titles, and kept the community going through the troubles I have mentioned. Just as there could have been no Cape Colony without the backing of the Dutch East India Company, and no British India without the capital and enterprise of the British East India Company, so there could have been no Rhodesia without the British South Africa Company. We need not then enquire whether the Company has justified the twenty-five years of its existence. A territory larger than Germany, France, and the Low Countries combined, brought under the British flag, settled with British colonists, and provided with security of property and life, and the machinery of civilisation—this is sufficient answer to that question. What we have to consider is (1) specific criticisms of the Company in the past, and (2) the justification for the continuance of Company rule in the immediate future.

As to specific criticisms, they relate mainly to the past acts and policy of the Company—the early alienation of land in large blocks to other companies; the Company's claims upon the mineral industry; and the high railway rates. Now alienation of land in large blocks is a charge made against the government of most new countries. We hear it made in Canada, in

the United States, in Australia, and in New Zealand. In most of these countries it is commonly used as a 'plank' in Opposition platforms. And in Rhodesia the defence is at least as good as could be advanced by other sinners in this respect. The Administration, in its early stages, had to face the enormous expenditure due to the want of communications and the vast extent of the country, into which everything had to be imported at almost prohibitive rates; and it had also to meet the heavy drain entailed by a series of unexampled misfortunes. In these circumstances its resources were insufficient for the development of one of its assets, the land. On the other hand, this land—or the great bulk of it—could not be developed by the individual settler, there being only a handful of colonists, and settlement by immigration being a slow and laborious process. To induce colonists to settle in a remote, undeveloped, and almost unknown land, where initial costs were enormous, and markets and communications as yet undeveloped, was obviously an almost impossible task.

The urgent need was to get a stream of capital applied to the development of the land; and the Company's capital was, as we have seen, diverted to other purposes by the harsh dictates of necessity. It had to build railways and roads, public offices and schools, to erect telegraph lines, to organise police and finance wars, and to stem the tide of great epidemics. The drain was so great that Rhodes mortgaged his personal income to this great task of what I may call creating the machinery of civilisation. The development of the land demanded fresh resources; and the only way to obtain these resources at that time was to allot large tracts of land to joint stock companies on the understanding that they would expend capital in Rhodesia. The object was to get development under way in the shortest possible time; and, if the policy did not achieve its object, it may at least be said that the object was at that time not achievable. The country had first to get through its almost fatal maladies of childhood before the land could be profitably developed, whatever method of development were adopted. Now that these troubles have been overcome, the policy of the Company has been changed; and the land will be gradually freed by purchase from the

grip of such companies as are unable to develop their territories. For the early policy of wholesale alienation the Company substituted a scheme by which land may be bought by the settler on a deferred instalment system, so that his capital is available for the development of his holding.

As to the Company's mining policy, the defence is also historical. When Rhodes asked for the financial support of a joint stock enterprise for a work which ought to have been undertaken by the Imperial Government, he had to offer some prospect of return on the capital subscribed. The land was obviously an asset which could not be realised in the immediate future; but Rhodesia was generally thought to be a highly mineralised country, and Rhodes offered his shareholders the prospect of a half-share in all mining enterprises—that is to say, half of the claims pegged out by prospectors and half the resulting vendor scrip. The proposal was not unreasonable, considering that the mining concessions were the property of the Company; but in practice it was found to check sound enterprise and encourage over-capitalisation. By 1903 the claim was abated to 30 per cent., and by 1907 the Company had substituted an easy and moderate royalty basis calculated on what the mines could fairly afford to pay. This grievance, certainly, is a grievance of the past.

The same may be said of the railways. Rhodesia is a high interior plateau approached either by the route from the Cape, some 1700 miles long, through the wilderness of Bechuanaland; or by the steep grades of the Beira Railway—a line built through a most unhealthy and difficult country—with some 700 miles of haulage to Bulawayo. Steep gradients, long distances, and heavy capital expenditure must involve high freights, unless the traffic is relatively large. But in Rhodesia the traffic has been relatively small, and until recently it has been nearly all one way. The laden wagons had to be hauled up the steep gradients from Beira or over the unproductive leagues of Bechuanaland, and then returned empty to the coast. These conditions and certain necessary rate arrangements with the Union system have kept rates high in the past, otherwise the Chartered Company, which had to guarantee debenture interest on the

2500 miles of railway with which it has provided Rhodesia, would have found itself in the bankruptcy court. But, with the growth of Rhodesian trade and the improvement of returns, rates are being progressively lowered, so that this grievance also is vanishing, so far as it ever can vanish in a country like South Africa, which is doomed by nature to heavy expenses of transport.

Besides these three substantial grievances there is the vaguer objection against Company government, well enough summed up in the phrase 'commercial taint.' This commercial taint, I might reply, has a pervasive flavour; it has been found by delicate and critical palates in most of the governments of the world, and has been even known to sour the pure milk of English Liberalism. I waive that point, as well as the reply that the anti-Charter Opposition, with its cry, 'the good things of the South,' cannot be acquitted of a commercial motive; and I admit frankly, as most men do, and as the Company certainly does, that Company government is an anomaly. Let me put it in this way. As soon as the people of Southern Rhodesia are able to take over the responsibilities and liabilities of the Administration, no one will stand in the way of their doing so. This certainly was the faith of Cecil Rhodes. 'When our territory becomes filled with white people,' he said in his first speech to the shareholders, 'there is one thing that we shall insist on—namely, self-government.' And the Company has, without pressure from outside, taken a series of steps in that direction. In 1898 Southern Rhodesia received its constitution, with four elected representatives against five official members on its Legislative Council. In 1903 and 1911 further steps were taken in this direction of increased popular control over legislation; and now in 1914 Southern Rhodesia has a council of 18 members, twelve popularly elected against six representatives of the Administration—a two to one majority for the people. The Company still, of course, retains, as all governments do, the exclusive right to propose money votes. In the homely metaphor applied by Rhodes in 1898, so long as it pays the piper, it must continue to set the tune. Let us for a moment return to that speech ('Life and Speeches,' pp. 679-681).

'My view is,' said Rhodes to the shareholders, 'that . . . that country shall become a self-governing State, just like another State in South Africa. The money spent on its conquest and development should, whenever these people become a full self-governing State, become a debenture debt of that country. . . . What will be pointed out to them is this, that, if they desire to become a self-governing State and take over the responsibilities of government, the first thing for them to do is to balance revenue and expenditure. . . . The essence of Englishmen is that they will be a self-governing State. . . . We are the most uncomfortable people in the world—we will insist on our rights, and will never stop until we get them. That is the essence and characteristic of our nation.'

Here we have to face two subsidiary questions which must be answered before we can settle our second point:

- (1) Is Southern Rhodesia ripe for self-government? and
- (2) What settlement is to be made with the Company as to the liabilities and assets of the present Administration?

As to the first question, it is well to remember that the colonists themselves have just decided by a majority, decisive and overwhelming, against immediate responsible government and for the continuance of the present system. The colonists of Southern Rhodesia have no lack of grit and courage, as is abundantly shown in their brief history. But they are faced by certain facts. They only number 30,000 all told; they are scattered over a country of nearly 150,000 square miles; and they would have to govern not only themselves but at least 800,000 natives—the indigenous population of Southern Rhodesia. If Northern Rhodesia were to be taken into account we should have to double the native population as well as the area, while the addition to the white population would be trifling.

These settlers, be it remembered, are busy men. They include only a very small proportion of men of leisure; yet they would have to supply the materials not only of a government, but of an alternative government. Moreover, it is of the highest importance that both parties should have at their head men of integrity and independence, so as to inspire in the natives a feeling of confidence in the Administration. The natives, following the Union precedent, would have no vote; they would naturally suspect the settlers of governing in the interest of the

settlers; they could only be reassured by the presence of two ruling parties, whose leaders were above the suspicion of using the government to improve the position of the white as against that of the black population.

Natal is often quoted as a good precedent for Rhodesia. Now Natal is a comparatively small country, and had 80,000 white settlers when it obtained responsible government. Can any one who has watched that colony honestly say that the relations between its Government and the natives have been satisfactory, or that the Government and the Opposition have afforded satisfactory elements for alternative government? Some of us have no great opinion of popular government anywhere; but if we wanted a favourable example we should not go to Natal.

And here I might say that under Chartered rule, the native population—numbering 1,500,000 in the two Rhodesias—is prosperous and contented. The native reserves amount to a quarter of the whole territory; and in ten years their cattle—the Bantu standard of wealth—have increased from 54,000 to 754,000 head. Under the present Administration their status, their rights, and their property have the guarantee not only of the Chartered Company but also of the Imperial Government. With self-government that guarantee would cease to be effective.

The prospect of embroilment with the natives, with all its costly consequences, would be in itself sufficient to restrain the eagerness of the small white population to enjoy the mixed blessings of responsible government. But there is also the question of finance. Hitherto the colonists have had what Sir Starr Jameson calls the cheque-book of the shareholders to see them through their difficulties; with responsible government they would be thrown on their own resources. Now it is true that administrative revenue and expenditure have actually been made to meet in the recent past; but they did not meet in 1912 and 1913, and they may not meet in 1914. And this balance, of course, leaves out of account the whole question of capital liability.

This brings us to our second subsidiary question. Rhodes included under the term expenditure a fair return on the money which the shareholders are out of pocket for the administration and defence of the country.

The amount of this money, which he regarded as a future national debt, is calculated at about 7,500,000*l*. But, as Mr Maguire stated a year ago, the Company is willing to give up all claim to the return of this sum so long as it is left in undisturbed possession of its assets. 'The Company,' he said, 'regards the accumulated deficits upon administration and defence as part of the cost of the acquisition, maintenance and development of the land and minerals of the territory.' Confident of its ownership of these assets, it asks no one to reimburse it for any part of their costs. But its ownership of the land has been assailed; and the question in dispute will shortly be brought before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It would, of course, be improper to anticipate the decision of that body; but let us take the alternatives. If the ownership is found to reside with the Company, the people of Rhodesia would have to start their administration without this great asset and the revenue obtained by the sale of land. If, on the other hand, the Judicial Committee decides that the land belongs not to the Company but in some way or other to the Rhodesian community, the shareholders' claim to be reimbursed by the community for the cost of acquiring, maintaining and developing that asset would be revived with irresistible force. In either case responsible government would have to face a liability either to take over the land of the Company at a fair valuation, or to meet the cost of the land up to the date of transfer. It does not matter to my argument which liability has to be faced; it is sufficient to say that the present resources of Rhodesia would not be available to meet either.

I assume of course that, if responsible government is instituted, the land would be taken over. Otherwise, there would indeed be a 'commercial taint'—on the one side a great Company owning 48,000,000 acres of land (in Southern Rhodesia alone), and on the other a responsible government representing people eager to possess that land. The result of such a situation would naturally be corruption on the one side, tempering confiscation—politely called taxation—on the other. No, if the Company goes, it must go lock, stock, and barrel; and before Rhodesia can fairly ask for responsible government, it must be prepared to meet not merely the

expense of its own administration, but either to finance the acquisition of the assets of the Chartered shareholders or to take over the liability incurred in the development of those assets.

But if, as was admitted in the recent elections, immediate responsible government is impossible, there remains the alternative of inclusion in the Union. Here again the people of Rhodesia have decided the question so far as it can be settled by them. In the recent elections only one candidate had the courage to propose inclusion, and he was defeated. Rhodesians, it will be allowed, have a right to decide the future of their own destinies; and, if the States of the Union desire inclusion, it should be sufficient answer that Rhodesia does not. General Botha has said quite frankly that he would like to see Rhodesia in the Union, his chief reason being that the free land of Rhodesia is desired for settlement by the Dutch. Rhodes said long ago that he had the 'sweet' veld and Kruger had the 'sour,' and that therefore he was getting Kruger's burghers. And it remains true that, while Rhodesia has a vast area of good land, the Union has a large number of landless Boers. Now the Dutch, if they are good settlers, are hospitably received by the Rhodesian Administration; but the Union Government, quite naturally, likes to have its own people under its own rule, and would rather see Rhodesia Dutchified than have its own people Anglicised. A remarkable proof of this was given in a recent petition, largely signed by the South African Dutch of the Union, that bilingualism should be officially established in Rhodesia; and the establishment of a branch of General Botha's Nationalist party in Salisbury, as well as the fairly obvious connexion between this party and the Rhodesian propagandists of Union, has convinced Rhodesians that the Union Government desires to control Rhodesia with a view to flooding the country with its own people and turning it into a predominantly Dutch State.

Now in South Africa there is no illusion as to the racial issue. It is not only alive but vigorous and aggressive. General Hertzog is known to be very strongly supported; and General Hertzog's position, either nakedly expressed or obviously implied, is that the Dutch must rule South Africa, that British South

Africans are 'foreign adventurers,' and that there must be no union and even no co-operation between the two races. It is for this reason mainly that Rhodesians have determined for the present to refuse Botha's offer.

If we look at this question from a British point of view, we shall not quarrel with the decision. For it is obvious that with the present small white population of Rhodesia, the country might be absorbed by the Dutch strain now politically predominant in the Union. In the Union at present we have a political minority of British governed by a political majority of Dutch. It is obvious that, from the British point of view, it would be better to have a political balance of the two races; and our best hope of reaching that position is to allow Rhodesia freedom to develop upon its present British lines—in other words, to guarantee it a separate existence until it is strong enough and its people numerous enough if they should so desire, to enter the Union upon terms which would redress the racial balance.

But there is a material argument also. Just as the United States recently tried to tempt Canada by the offer of reciprocity, so Rhodesia has been tempted by the offer of 'the good things of the South.' The appeal failed in both cases, partly because the racial or national instinct is stronger than even the love of gain, and partly because the argument is felt to be, even from the point of view of self-interest, not entirely sound. For example, Rhodesia requires all its available natives for its own labour-market; but the Transvaal is clamouring for native labour for the gold industry of the Rand and the farms of the Burghers. If Rhodesia were to enter the Union, it is certain that this clamour, supported by the whole financial and political interest of the Union, would overbear Rhodesia's claim to have its own labour for its own mines and its own farms.

Moreover, against these 'good things of the South,' this 'fleshpots of Egypt' appeal, we must set the 'quails and manna' provided by the shareholders—what Sir Starr Jameson has called 'the cheque-book of the Company.' Thus, for example, the Company has given Rhodesia 2500 miles of railway—a mile of line for every twelve Europeans, as against the Union's mile of line for every 162 Europeans. In education Southern Rhodesia had,

at the beginning of 1913, 44 Government and five aided schools for European scholars, the number of children attending being 2138; while the census of 1911 showed a European school attendance of close on 50 per cent. of the European children of school-going age. Rhodesian farmers have at their service an Agricultural Department at least as efficient and enterprising as that of the Union. They are helped to buy their land, to fence their farms, and to market their produce. The Rhodesia Land Bank, a Government institution, has, since it commenced operations in the latter part of 1912, advanced upwards of 250,000*l.* in moderate loans to nearly four hundred settlers on the security of their farms. In these and other ways the Rhodesia Administration is doing as much for its people as the Union Government for the people of the Union.

So we are forced back upon this conclusion, to which indeed the people of Rhodesia have already arrived, as shown beyond all dispute by the recent elections, that the only possible course is a continuation of the present system—a renewal of the Charter for another term of ten years. In other words, Company rule is justified, not only by its general record in the past, but because there is no practical alternative in the immediate future. If it is said that the Charter might be modified, or continued for a shorter term than the statutory period, it would naturally be replied that, if the Company is to continue, it must have a reasonable measure of security. It would be altogether unreasonable to expect the shareholders to embark capital afresh on new conditions less stable than the old.

When the time comes for Rhodesia to take over its own affairs from the old lady of London Wall who has rocked its cradle and seen it through the weaknesses and ailments of youth, the Company will have no reason to be ashamed of its record. The success of Rhodesia is already assured. Gold, so far its staple industry, has already reached the respectable figure of 3,000,000*l.* a year. Cattle diseases have been subdued, and herds are rapidly increasing; the possibilities of Rhodesia as a ranching country are enormous. Agriculture, especially in maize and tobacco, is making rapid progress. The Wankie coal-fields are producing a large

amount of excellent coal; and there is a great market opening out for Rhodesian coal and produce in the successful copper mines of Katanga across the Northern border. New railway routes are turning Rhodesia's eyes to the north, to which she holds the key. In administration revenue and expenditure have thrice been made to meet. The railway returns keep on increasing by leaps and bounds. In all this work of development, the shareholders have supported the colonists without receiving any dividend in twenty-five years. They have shouldered all the liabilities and met all the deficits; and they can now point to Rhodesia as a going concern, a great Dominion under the British flag, a growing market for British goods, an invaluable outlet for British youth and British enterprise. Rhodesia actually led the Empire by being the first to give a Customs preference to British imports, a precedent that has now been followed by all the Dominions. And the Company might reply to its critics in the words used by Cecil Rhodes himself when he addressed the shareholders in 1895 ('Life and Speeches,' p. 440):

'We have been accused,' he said, 'of being a speculative set of company-mongers, but no one who started this idea could have seen any great hope of financial success from it. By your support we have carried it through. Whenever the man in the street sneers in that way, remind him that it was an undertaking which he had not the courage to take part in himself as one of the British people. The Imperial Government would not touch it. The Cape Government was too poor to do so. It has been done, however, and is a success. I do not think any one would say now that he would prefer to see that portion of the world under another flag. It has been done also—which the English people like—without expense to their exchequer.'

Such is the work of the Chartered Company; and, if details are open to criticism, the sum total of an enterprise so valuable to the Empire is surely deserving of its gratitude.

IAN D. COLVIN.

II.—AGAINST THE CHARTER.*

THE year 1914 marks a crisis in the history of Southern Rhodesia. During this year the Imperial Government, into whose keeping its ultimate destiny is committed, will be called upon to determine what the future of the country is to be. The impending decision is awaited with concern. No one outside Rhodesia can realise the intense though suppressed excitement which prevails. That an important organic change of some kind is inevitable is felt by every one. There are wide differences of opinion among the settlers as to what that change ought to be; but all are equally impressed with the feeling that upon its extent and character depend not only the degree of progress the country will make in the immediate future but also the nature of the part Rhodesia will play in the years to come.

On the 29th of October next, twenty-five years will have elapsed since the late Queen Victoria set her sign manual to the Royal warrant granting the charter which gave the British South Africa Company a corporate existence. The rights, powers, jurisdictions and authorities conferred on the Company are generous and ample in their scope. On the whole the verdict of our time must be that these rights and privileges have been wisely and prudently exercised, whilst the duties and obligations corresponding to them have been discharged with a reasonable regard for the interests of the settler.

The British South Africa Company is the most important of several companies created by charter in recent times, on which was bestowed the twofold character of some of those early chartered companies that played so important a part in the British acquisition of India and the European occupation of North America. In one of its characters it is purely a commercial company, aiming at profits for its shareholders; in its other character it is a government vested with sovereign administrative authority within certain territorial limits. The British North Borneo Company and the Royal Niger Company are other instances of modern corporations possessing

* This article was written some time before the recent elections, which gave a majority for renewal of the Charter.—EDITOR.

this double character. The former still combines both functions, but the latter has lost its governmental powers and now exists only as a purely commercial enterprise. The administrative powers of a company are obviously of enormous advantage to it as a means to the furtherance of its financial schemes. But, sooner or later, an antagonism is bound to arise between its profit-making investments and the material interests of the colonists. Friction ensues; discontent arises; and finally Imperial intervention puts an end to the dual character of the Company. At the time when the British South Africa Company's charter was given, the Imperial Government, foreseeing that in the historic evolution of events this stage would inevitably be reached, carefully provided the means by which in due time the surrender of the Company's administrative functions might be effected with the least possible injustice to the Company itself and the least possible dislocation of the public service. Section 33 of the Charter provides as follows:—

‘ And we do further will, ordain and declare that it shall be lawful for Us, Our heirs and successors and We do hereby expressly reserve to Ourselves, Our heirs and successors the right and power by writing under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom at the end of twenty-five years from the date of this Our Charter, and at the end of every succeeding period of ten years, to add to alter or repeal any of the provisions of this Our Charter or to enact other provisions in substitution for or in addition to any of its existing provisions. Provided that the right and power thus reserved shall be exercised only in relation to so much of this Our Charter as relates to administrative and public matters. . . .’

The question now is whether existing conditions in Rhodesia are such that it has become either necessary or expedient that the Imperial Government should exercise the powers reserved to it by this section, and relieve the British South Africa Company of its administrative responsibilities, and, if so, what kind of government should be substituted. The object of this article is to present the case of that section of the Rhodesian settlers, steadily increasing in number, who have grown weary of the existing *régime* and who believe that, at any rate so far as Southern Rhodesia is concerned, it would be

an advantage to escape from the commercial rule of its present masters.

The crisis towards which Southern Rhodesia is rapidly moving cannot be properly understood without some knowledge of the material progress the territory has made since the arrival of the pioneers in 1891, as well as of existing economic and political conditions. Confining ourselves to Southern Rhodesia, the net result is a population of some 27,000 or 28,000 Europeans in an area of 148,575 square miles; 1849 miles of railway, 3096 miles of telegraphs, a monthly gold output of 56,830 ounces, valued at 239,036*l.* (the figures for November last), and a public revenue of 757,486*l.* for the year ended March 31, 1913, to meet an expenditure of 884,786*l.*

The supporters and admirers of the Chartered Company, impressed by these figures, are disposed to dwell on this record with pride, and for the sake of contrast draw attention to the slow progress of some other parts of South Africa, notably Bechuanaland, which come under the direct surveillance of Downing Street. The comparison in this case is singularly unfair, for the southern portion of Bechuanaland, distinguished from the rest of the territory as British Bechuanaland, was annexed to Cape Colony in 1895 and is now a portion of the Union; whilst the northern portion, known as the Protectorate, is still under the rule of its native chiefs, subject to guidance from the Imperial Government, and is not administered as a territory for European colonisation at all. The opponents of the Company, on the contrary, with their eyes on the ceaseless stream of emigrants from the British Isles and from the continent of Europe pouring into Canada and other parts of the Empire, are not so favourably impressed by a recital of the Company's achievements, and declare with some bitterness that the work accomplished by the Chartered Company, and quoted with so much satisfaction, is not really much to boast of. In thus drawing attention to the sparseness of the population they are on strong ground, for even the most determined admirer of the Chartered Company is forced to acknowledge that in these days of rapid communications, of railways speeding overland and swift steamships plying between one part of the world and another, an average annual

addition to the population of ten or twelve hundred in a new country like Rhodesia, possessing the attractions of gold, sport and perpetual sunshine, is pitifully small. A glance at the following tables should prove instructive.

TABLES SHOWING THE GROWTH OF POPULATION IN THE SELF-GOVERNING COLONIES OF AUSTRALASIA AND SOUTH AFRICA.

	New South Wales.	Victoria.	Western Australia.	Queensland.	New Zealand.
1861	350,000	540,000	—	34,000	—
1871	505,000	731,000	25,000	125,000	256,000
1881	750,000	862,000	29,708	213,000	490,000
1891	1,130,000	1,140,000	49,782	394,000	626,000
1901	1,354,846	1,201,070	184,124	498,129	773,000
1911	1,646,734	1,315,551	282,114	605,813	1,008,468

	South Australia.		Tasmania.
1866	163,000	1835	40,000
1876	213,000	1892	153,000
1891	320,000	1901	172,475
1901	358,346	1911	191,211
1911	408,558		

Cape Colony (Whites).		Natal (Whites).		Transvaal (Whites).		Orange Free State (Whites).	
1865	181,000	1870	18,000	1872	{ estimated 25,000 to 30,000	1872	{ estimated 20,000
1875	236,000	1891	47,000	1890	119,000	1890	77,000
1891	376,000	1904	97,109	1904	289,152	1904	142,679
1904	579,741	1911	98,582	1911	420,831	1911	174,435
1911	583,177						

If it is said that war and rebellion arrested the steady development of the country, war and rebellion have also afflicted every other part of South Africa now occupied by Europeans. If again it is urged that rinderpest, East Coast Fever, and other scourges have stood in the way of progress, plague and pestilence have similarly visited every other part of South Africa. It is seventeen years since the Chartered Company had any serious trouble with the natives; and, although East Coast Fever still exists in certain districts, it is kept well under control, and its ravages have never been so extensive as to oppose an appreciable check to immigration. Judged by

results, the Chartered Company cannot, in so far as it set itself to establish a European population in Rhodesia, be said to have fulfilled expectation. Railways, telegraphs and public buildings are solid facts, but these things in an empty land are a testimony rather to the faith of its rulers than proof of progress actually made.

The resources of Rhodesia, agricultural as well as mineral, are acknowledged to be good. The climate is excellent. Money has been freely expended on the means of development. How comes it then that after twenty-four years of effort the total white population is only about 25,000? The opponents of the Company find the answer to this question in the circumstance that, in its ultimate aim and purpose, it is a purely commercial undertaking. Mr Hawksley, when he visited the country in 1907, reminded the settlers that the Company was formed, as he blandly put it, for the 'acquisition of gain.' The country's progress must depend mainly on the prevailing economic conditions. If these are good, the settlers will rapidly become prosperous; and the world outside, attracted by their success, will hasten in to try its fortune in a land so full of promise, and in so doing will add still further to the prosperity of the community. If, on the other hand, the economic conditions are bad, business will languish, the settlers will grow discouraged, and progress will be slow. Here then we are brought to the point. The fact that the Chartered Company is a commercial company, whose business is gain, is a most important factor in the determination of these economic conditions that mean so much.

In the foregoing paragraph we have in truth laid bare the secret cause of all the present discontent. It is safe to assert that the complaints and grievances of the settlers can all be traced to this baneful commercial influence. Such was the case from the very first. The numerous concessions the Company began to give out, almost from the moment of occupation; the extreme reluctance with which it acceded to the most pressing reforms in the mining law, such as the abandonment of its right to 50 per cent., or later to 30 per cent., of the vendors' scrip on the flotation of mining claims; the substitution at a later date of a system of royalties for its share of vendors' scrip, and the partial abolition of

the system by which mining locations could be held indefinitely by periodical payments of money called inspections instead of by development; the claim kept up for many years to a large portion of the public revenue as being the commercial income of the B. S. A. C. and only partly abandoned a few years ago; the claim, disputed by the settlers, that the land is the private asset of the Chartered Company; the progressive inferiority from year to year of the land titles granted by the Company; the failure of the Company to keep its promise in respect of what is known as the Victoria Agreement; the various attempts made, e.g. by the Goldie Scheme, to obtain from the settlers by indirect means an admission of liability for past deficits as well as acceptance of the principle of a public debt; the high prices demanded for land; and, last and not least, the present Land Settlement Scheme—these instances and many others too numerous for mention afford overwhelming proof that, all along, the mercantile interests of the Chartered Company and the steadily growing needs of the settlers have too often been in conflict.

This opposition between the Company and the settlers was not always as pronounced as it is now. While Mr Rhodes was alive the settlers felt they had a sympathetic mediator between themselves and the London Board. With his death their relations with the Chartered Company became much less cordial. The Goldie Scheme, sprung upon the country early in 1904, was a rude awakening. They have never forgotten it. This article is more concerned with the present and the future than with the investigation of past errors, for which reason it is enough to say that the scheme, in its original form, sought to impose on the future government of the country a debt of eight millions, the estimated amount of past administrative deficits. It was proposed to raise a loan for this amount,* out of which the Chartered Company promised to spend three millions on development; the balance was to be used for the furtherance

* Sir G. Goldie said in his letter published in the Report of the Salisbury Conference, 'I suggest that the debt, when ascertained, shall be funded; that the Chartered Company shall retain only five millions sterling, as a Private Fund; and that the balance shall be given by the Company to a Trust Fund for the benefit of Southern Rhodesia.'

of its own ends. Rhodesians were up in arms. They acknowledged no liability for past deficits, maintaining that the administrative functions of the Chartered Company were imposed on it as an obligation, not conferred as a privilege. In other words, they said it was the *duty* of the Company to maintain law and order. The scheme was withdrawn in deference to the public outcry. It served a useful purpose, however, for it created public opinion. Ever since then Rhodesians have been divided into two parties—the pro-Charter party and the anti-Charter party. The dividing line has been very indistinct, the opinions of the great majority wavering hesitatingly between the two, now inclining to the one side and now to the other; but slowly and surely this great mass of fluid opinion has been hardening, so that at the present time there are few, however much they may try to preserve an open mind, who do not in their secret thoughts feel they have made their election and are henceforth either pro-Charter or anti-Charter.

The pro-Charter party is necessarily a strong one. It includes with scarcely an exception all those who, either directly or indirectly, are dependent upon the Chartered Company for their daily bread. Practically the whole of the Civil Service belongs to it; and the Civil Service forms no mean fraction of the total population. This party would also secure the mining vote. All men engaged in mining or who follow occupations or pursuits connected with mining are to be found in its ranks. The connexion between the Company and the mining industry is a curious one. The big mining companies were formed for the most part at a time when the Company took a large share of the vendors' scrip on the flotation of claims. Hence they are in a sense subsidiaries or offshoots of the Company. In the case of some of them the Company has the right to be represented on their boards of management by one or more directors. Others of them again are under financial obligations to the Company. Their mutual interests have thus in time become so intimately interwoven that it has become most difficult, if not impossible, for them to act independently; and this is true not only when mining matters alone are involved but on all important occasions. Mining is of course

the premier industry in Rhodesia. It gives employment to a large number of men both white and black. The employees naturally vote as their employers wish. Very few of them have an outlook much beyond the boundaries of the mine in which they are employed. They identify themselves with the mining industry and are content, without much reflection, to back with their suffrages any policy which they understand the leaders of the industry have decided to support. It will thus be seen that, through the medium of the big companies, the influence of the Chartered Company in all mining areas is very strong. The small syndicates and individual workers are not quite on the same footing. The Chartered Company has not the same hold over them as it has over the wealthier mining corporations, and these have at times shown a surprising independence of spirit; but their interests are nevertheless so wrapped up with those of the mining industry as a whole that they are bound on most occasions to fall into line with its more influential representatives. For these reasons the Company is likely to find a large number of adherents among the 'tributors' and small workers.

The remaining components of the pro-Charter party do not call for special remark. The Chartered Company and the big mining companies stand for wealth and capital. Mammon has his worshippers in Rhodesia as well as elsewhere. Hence all those who from temperament, instinct or mere self-interest are usually to be found on the side of wealth and privilege are stalwarts in the ranks of this party. Lastly, the men who have come here to seek fortune and who fondly believe they will return to the old country in a few years when they have made their pile, who know no other part of South Africa and have no ambitions in regard to it, who fear the Dutch because they do not know them, and are pilgrims and strangers, mere birds of passage here for a season only—these men imagine there is no government to compare with that of the Company, and, until the bitterness of years has brought them disappointment and riper judgment, will be amongst its staunchest supporters.

The men on the other side offer a striking contrast. The farmers, as a class, belong to the anti-Charter party and hold the same relative position in its ranks as the

mining men do in the ranks of the pro-Charter party. Bound as a class by no ties to the Chartered Company and leading lives of comparative isolation, they have developed a sturdy and independent spirit, which stands them in good stead whenever they can agree upon a united course of action; but they suffer from the defects of their own virtues, and their robust independence produces so much diversity of thought among themselves that they are seldom found acting in complete unison. The farming industry is not, and probably cannot be, organised in the same way as the mining industry. The Agricultural Union, composed of delegates from the various farmers' associations throughout the country, is their principal organisation; and through it the collective opinion of the industry, so far as such can be ascertained, finds expression. But, after all, the Agricultural Union and its affiliated Associations are formed merely for purposes of discussion. The industry is not organised like the mining industry for purposes of common endeavour. The mining industry is a system; and every mine in the country is worked through and under the system, full and detailed returns being sent monthly to the Chamber of Mines and the Government. There is nothing corresponding to this among the farmers. As a consequence, they display a corresponding lack of uniformity in action and opinion. Yet, on occasions, they have shown that when roused they can act together. The Labour Tax resistance movement is an example. In 1911 an Ordinance was passed through the Legislative Council which imposed a tax of 1s. per month per man on all employers of labour. The proceeds of the tax were not to be paid into the Treasury as revenue but to be handed over to the Labour Bureau, an organisation for the collection and distribution of labour. The farmers objected to the principle of the tax, but the Ordinance was passed in spite of their protest. They decided to oppose it when put into operation by passive resistance, and carried out their resolve. Hundreds were convicted and fined. They refused to pay the fines. A few were sent to gaol, but in most instances, when the convicted men were sent to prison, their fines were paid by their opponents. That state of things clearly could not continue; and serious trouble was only averted by the

wisdom of the Administrator, who came to an understanding with the President of the Agricultural Union, whereby it was tacitly agreed that, if the farmers undertook to abandon further resistance, the Secretary of State for the Colonies would be asked by the Company to exercise his right of veto and disallow the Ordinance. This was accordingly done. So far as the present posture of affairs is concerned, the farming vote may be reckoned as anti-Charter; but beyond that nothing can be affirmed with certainty. As to what form of government should replace the Chartered Company in case of its losing the Administration, there are great differences of opinion among them.

Apart from the farmers, there is no distinct class or section of the population which can be said to be wholly or mainly anti-Charter. It is, however, probably true that the bulk of those who are opposed to the Chartered Company are South African by birth. The difference between the South African and the home-born man in Rhodesia is not hard to explain. In all relations except politics there is complete forgetfulness of origin; the most perfect amity prevails. The difference in politics arises in this way. The Rhodesian of South African birth has three patriotisms—a local or Rhodesian patriotism, a South African patriotism, and the patriotism of Empire. He has made Rhodesia his home; here he means to stay; and he loves Rhodesia with the fervent attachment every man has for the land which he has made his home and in which at last he means to lay his bones. But he was born in some other part of South Africa; a longing for the unity of South Africa and a love for South Africa as a whole is bred in him. None the less does he love the Empire; often in his tenderest years he received into his mind never-to-be-forgotten pictures of the homeland from the lips of a mother who expected to see it no more. The Empire appeals to his imagination; and his great ambition is to see South Africa occupy a more important position, and take a fuller part in the work of Empire than she has done in the past. Even amongst the Dutch, especially the more intelligent, many of them born in British colonies and brought up under British institutions, this sense of Empire is much stronger than is commonly believed. The home-born Rhodesian

has but two patriotisms—the Rhodesian patriotism and the Imperial. He has of course the patriotism of the country of his birth, but that is quite apart from his feeling for Rhodesia. He has not the same sentiment for South Africa as a whole as his colonial brother. Often Rhodesia is the only part of South Africa that he knows; and, when he thinks of Rhodesia in connexion with the Empire, he thinks of it apart from the rest of South Africa. Mistakes are made on both sides. The home-born man, not being able to enter into the feeling which a good South African has for South Africa as a whole, is inclined to tell himself, when he sees the latter striving with all his might for South African unity, that his friend is not quite so British, quite so Imperial, as he could wish. The good South African, on the other hand, perhaps attaching too much importance to his beloved South Africa as an integral portion of the Empire, wonders what kind of imperialism that must be which takes such a narrow view of South Africa's place in the system. Happily for both life is not all politics.

For the rest, the anti-Charter party consists chiefly of professional men, traders and other business men not connected with any particular industry, who have thought matters out for themselves. No doubt it also numbers amongst its adherents many of that class which, for various reasons, is always to be found ranged on the side of discontent. Such men are to be found everywhere; the most wisely governed states are not free from them. But, when their numbers are large and, as years pass, do not grow less but seem rather to increase, it is a sure sign that 'something is rotten in the state of Denmark.' Without question there is and has been for a long time a great deal of discontent in Rhodesia. It has existed more or less ever since its founder's death. Less than two years after that event a Conference held at Salisbury to consider the Goldie Scheme—a body of some forty representative men from all parts of the country—passed the following resolutions, the first unanimously and the latter with only one dissentient:

1. 'That it is desirable that the administrative rights of the B. S. A. Company shall cease so soon as they can be relieved of the responsibility for any deficiency between revenue and expenditure.

2. 'That this Conference records its conviction that Southern Rhodesia can make no true progress so long as the B. S. A. Company as an administrative or commercial body has any control or power in the direction of public affairs.' . . .

In 1907 so great had the discontent become that the High Commissioner, Lord Selborne, paid a special visit to Rhodesia to enquire into its causes; and a few months later, apparently as a result of his representations, three of the Directors, accompanied by their legal adviser and the Company's Secretary, came to the territory to placate the settlers. For the moment they succeeded. A number of grievances were redressed. Business, which had been stagnant, at once improved; and the country, which had been languishing for want of business, soon began to wear the appearance of prosperity. The improvement, however, was short-lived. The changes effected by the Directors were merely palliatives, bringing immediate alleviation but not touching the seat of mischief. Obstructions had been placed across the course of the stream; their partial removal increased the flow but did not permit the full volume of water to pass through. Most people were deceived, thinking the waters had been augmented; whereas in fact only a smaller quantity was being diverted. Discontent soon reared its head again.

The attitude of the Government in regard to the supply and distribution of indigenous labour for a long time gave great dissatisfaction, especially to the farmers. In 1911 the Labour Tax Ordinance was passed. It came into force on January 1, 1912, but, owing to the resistance of the farmers, was disallowed after a few months. In May of the same year the Agricultural Union passed a resolution asking for 'a complete reform of the Constitution' and suggesting as the basis for a new one:

1. 'A Legislative Assembly to consist of the Administrator and not more than five official members and of not less than fifteen or more than twenty elected members.

2. 'The official members to be nominated and appointed by the High Commissioner, and to constitute the Executive Council.' . . .

Four months later the Rhodesian League, a political organisation advocating the same policy as that adopted

by the farmers, came into existence. In April, 1913, after the Company had made a declaration of its policy through Mr Maguire, one of the Directors, a Special Congress of the Agricultural Union passed the following resolution :

‘That this Congress, having considered the statement of policy made by Mr Maguire on behalf of the Chartered Co., is of the opinion that the Imperial Government should exercise its prerogative and relieve the Chartered Co. of its administrative responsibilities, and grant to the people a form of government consistent with the present status of the country.’

Finally, only a few months ago a petition signed by some 1300 farmers was forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies setting forth various grounds of complaint against the Chartered Company and asking for the appointment of a Royal Commission.

From this rapid summary it should be clear that there prevails widespread discontent, and that such discontent is of no recent birth, though latterly it has become much more outspoken and pronounced. Since 1907 the Chartered Company has done little or nothing to appease the malcontents. Two steps taken ostensibly with that object may be referred to. Probably on account of the attitude taken up by the Agricultural Union, the question of additional representation came up for consideration in the Legislative Council during the session of 1912. The Administrator then announced that the Company would agree to two additional elected members, on condition of an equal number being added to the Government nominees; and from this he declared the Company would not budge. The Council at that time consisted of seven elected members and five Government nominees. However, the establishment of the Rhodesian League and other signs of rising ferment caused the Company to reconsider its decision; and less than a year later Mr Maguire announced that it had been decided to raise the number of the public representatives to twelve. The next Council will therefore consist of six nominated and twelve elected members.

The other step has probably provoked more blunt criticism of the Company and its ways than anything it has done for years past. About six months ago it

became known that the Company was engaged in the preparation of a big Land Settlement Scheme. Inspired newspapers alluded to it in glowing forecasts, and public expectation rose high. Mr Malcolm, a director, came to Rhodesia and spent two or three months in the country to prepare the way for its reception. Everything possible was done to make it attractive. The Directors were, however, to receive an unexpected shock. On the 28th of November last, at one of the largest public meetings ever held in Bulawayo, about 1000 people being present, the following resolution was carried by a clear majority :

‘This meeting of citizens of Bulawayo and district, whilst recognising the necessity for the encouragement of immigration, declines to accept the Land Settlement Scheme submitted by the B. S. A. Company for the following reasons :

‘1. That it involves the admission that the unalienated land of South Rhodesia is the private property of the B. S. A. Company.

‘2. That it further involves the principle of a public debt on the future government of the country.’

In current colloquial phrase, it was ‘turned down. In Salisbury its reception was no better. Only in the midlands and at points along the railway line, where-soever two or three could be gathered together to meet the Directors, was it received with any cordiality. Sir Starr Jameson has since made much of the fact that, a few days after the Bulawayo meeting, twelve representative gentlemen came to him and told him they did not agree with the popular verdict. They expressed their regret at what had happened and, after what appears to have been a very friendly discussion, agreed to certain modifications ; but it is hardly likely that Sir Starr Jameson and his twelve apostles will succeed in shaking the resolute determination of the general public to have none of it. On the merits of the scheme itself it is not necessary to enter. They hardly come within the scope of this article. It is enough to say that the scheme was not formed by the Company solely as a means of putting itself on good terms with the Rhodesian public. There was another reason for it. The Company on its commercial side would benefit by it.

The Directors, having failed to captivate the public

with their Land Settlement Scheme, have now begun to exert themselves openly to influence the forthcoming elections. It should be explained here that there are at the present moment two Directors in Rhodesia, Sir Starr Jameson and Mr Wilson Fox (Mr Bouchier F. Hawksley, the Company's legal adviser, after spending about six weeks in the country, left in December last). Evidently their business here is to do what they can to persuade the settlers to accept a renewal of Company administration for a further term of years. They have made no concealment of their purpose, nor is it suggested that they are not within their rights in using all legitimate means in their power to that end. The importance of these elections can hardly be exaggerated; for it is certain that the Imperial Government will be guided to a large extent by their result in deciding what steps to take in October next. Seeing that so much depends on them, it is pertinent to enquire to what extent these elections may be regarded as truly reflecting the public mind. The close and intimate relation in which the large mining companies stand to the Chartered Company, and which places them in a position of inevitable subordination to it, has already been adverted to. Indeed, the hold which the Chartered Company has over the electorate through these large employers of labour, and as itself the largest employer of labour, is enormous. But it is not only through the companies that the Chartered Company is able to reach the electors. In a hundred other ways the voters can be made to feel its power, a power indeed which need not be exerted to be felt. In truth, one of the most disquieting features of the present system is that the Company can do no good work in the country without at the same time trammelling the public to an equivalent degree. An illustration will make this sufficiently clear. About two years ago the Chartered Company established a Land Bank, a most useful institution, chiefly in the interests of agriculture. Liberal advances have been made to farmers, who, as has already been shown, are as a class strongly opposed to the Company. Yet every farmer who has accepted a loan from the Land Bank feels that, while the debt remains unpaid, his lips are sealed. If these things are borne in mind, it requires no demonstration to see that, even

without taking active part in election work, the Chartered Company is always able to secure the return of a fair number of its supporters.

The issue then before the country is, the Chartered Company or Union. So at least say the Directors. Not so their adversaries, who prefer the cry of Charter or no Charter. It may be the Directors are right; at any rate it is in their power to force the issue. But, whatever the issue may be, the choice lies between the Chartered Company on the one side and some other form of government on the other. Hence it becomes necessary to examine all the possible alternatives. There are three: representative government under the Crown, responsible government, and Union. No other form of government can be thought of for a moment, the country having long since passed beyond the stage at which direct autocratic administration from Downing Street is practicable.

Of the three forms of government just named, responsible government may be dismissed in a few words. It is of course the ideal solution, but one which can hardly be considered in connexion with Rhodesia at the present stage of its development. The Imperial Government would never dream of granting self-government to a mere handful of less than 30,000 whites, scattered over an area of 148,575 square miles, and living side by side with an indigenous black population of close upon a million. Further, the Government would be at once beset with financial difficulties. It would have to take over certain public works. It would require loans for development. If it declined to take over the railways, it would be at the mercy of the railway companies; and, if it took them over, the debt thereby placed upon the country would severely tax the strength of the community. Moreover, with so small a population, there would be a real danger in responsible government. The Chartered Company, still powerful though deprived of the administration, would be a factor to be reckoned with. Under present conditions, considerations of decency, morality and common prudence impose some restraint upon the Company at election times; but, with the trammels of government removed, it would be free to take part in the elections without let or hindrance.

The Company would probably be in a better position than ever; it would control the Legislature and overshadow the administration.

It is principally because responsible government has to be ruled out as a possible alternative to the present *régime* that the Rhodesian League has put forward its demand for representative government. Responsible government is the League's ultimate goal, to which representative government is believed to be a stepping-stone. There is much to be said for the proposal. All the self-governing colonies, before attaining full autonomy, passed through a form of representative government under the Crown. It is a type of government capable of infinite variation, but its essential feature is that its Legislature is elected, while its Executive, which is nominated by the Imperial Government, is responsible, not to the Legislature but to the Crown. The special variety of representative government recommended by the Rhodesian League follows very closely the lines of the Lyttelton Constitution, granted to the Transvaal by the last Conservative Government in 1905. That measure was never given a trial; for, before any election could be held under it, the Liberals came into power and the Transvaal obtained the full management of its own affairs. The advantages to Rhodesia under representative government would be the elimination of the commercial influence of the Chartered Company on the administration, the settlement of all important outstanding questions between the Company and the settlers, the control of legislation by the representatives of the people, and, not the least important, the ability of the people to negotiate with the Union Government on their own behalf with regard to terms of admission, should it be found to be for the advantage of Rhodesia to cast in her lot with the Union. The only objection, or rather difficulty, in the way of representative government as a solution is the probable reluctance of the Imperial Government to assume any financial responsibility in connexion with these territories. That reluctance may be taken for granted. It would be as true of a Conservative as it is of the present Liberal Government. From the standpoint of the Imperial Government it is clear that the most satisfactory settlement would be

the third alternative, viz. the immediate admission of Rhodesia into the Union.

The case for Union, owing to the deliberate and considered emphasis with which both Sir Starr Jameson and Mr Hawksley have warned Rhodesians against it, requires a somewhat closer examination than has been given to the two forms dealt with. There are certain objections which it is as well to admit or dispose of at once. First of all, it is said that the representation which would be given to Rhodesia in the Union parliament would be relatively so insignificant that an adequate discussion of Rhodesian affairs could not be secured, and Rhodesian interests would consequently suffer. This objection loses sight of the fact that Rhodesia in the Union would possess and enjoy the full dignity of a province, and would be entitled to representation in the Union Assembly in accordance with that status; and, further, that the advantages conceded to the Orange Free State and Natal in that respect would necessarily be extended to Rhodesia. It also takes no account of the fact that in the Senate there is equality of representation, each province returning a like number of members. Besides, Rhodesia would have its own Provincial Council for the regulation of its internal affairs.

A second objection is the one raised by those who admit that Union is inevitable and even desirable, but say that the time is not ripe for that event. They maintain that the country must make considerable progress before it can be deemed advisable to take so important a step. The plea for delay is set up in most cases to conceal a real antipathy to Union or a vague fear that it may be followed by unpleasant consequences. The objection is unreasonable. Since the inclusion of Rhodesia would establish permanent relations between Rhodesia and the other members of the Union, the point of real importance is clearly not the date of entry, but the terms of admission. If better terms can be obtained now than later, then surely now is the accepted time; but, if not, then now is as surely not the time. We ought to know on what terms admission would be possible *now*, before we can be entitled even to an opinion as to whether better or worse terms could be obtained in the future.

A much more serious objection than either of the two already mentioned is bilingualism. The Union is a bilingual country; it recognises the equality of the English and Dutch languages. Rhodesia is satisfied with one language. It must be granted that this is a grave and formidable objection which cannot easily be set aside. But it is an objection to Union at any time, whether now or later; and Rhodesians who regard partnership with the Southern Provinces as inevitable must make up their minds to accept bilingualism with the best grace they can. Still it is not impossible that a way out of the difficulty may be found; special terms might be made for Rhodesia.

A further objection to immediate inclusion will be referred to presently. Meanwhile let us take a glance at one or two of the advantages. The first and most material gain will be a great reduction in the cost of living. Rhodesia is the most expensive part of the Empire to live in. According to the report of a committee recently appointed to enquire into the excessive cost of living in Rhodesia, 27 per cent. of the married men, for reasons of economy, send their wives and families out of the country and provide for their maintenance elsewhere. The chief cause of this alarming state of things is to be found in the ruinous rates charged on the various Rhodesian railways. The following table shows the marked difference between the rates on the Rhodesian lines and the Union railways:

A.—Union Railways, Port Elizabeth to Vryburg (Elevation 3890 ft.), 612 miles.			Rhodesia Railways, Vryburg to Bulawayo* (Elevation 4469 ft.), 588 miles.		
		s. d.			
1st class	.	7 1	14 8	} per 100 lbs.	
2nd class	.	4 1	10 0		
3rd class	.	3 1	7 4		

This table shows that the Rhodesia Railways are extracting rates twice as high as those payable to the Cape Railways, although the distance is less and there is no long pull up from the coast.

With the entry of Rhodesia the Union Government would take over the railways; the cost of acquisition

* The above is taken from a pamphlet published by the Rhodesia Chamber of Mines in April, 1913.

would be borne by the Union as a whole and would not fall on Rhodesia alone; and as, under the Act of Union, the railways are worked only for actual cost and are not allowed to earn a profit, the benefits which Rhodesia would derive by the change would be enormous.

In connexion with the railway question a matter that deserves some consideration is the situation that would arise if feeling in the Union towards Rhodesia ceased from some cause or other to be as brotherly as it is to-day. During the last session of the Legislative Council the Treasurer hinted at the possible withdrawal of Rhodesia from the Customs Union with a view to the taxation of Union products. If the Union finds that the idea of amalgamation is scouted and that its exports are taxed, it may be induced to retaliate by putting up its railway rates as against Rhodesia. It is usually argued that such a step could be met by importing through the Portuguese port of Beira. But it must not be forgotten that the Rhodesia Railways own the line between Vryburg and Bulawayo, a length of 588 miles. The Chartered Company, which controls all the railways, could not afford to allow this line to remain unused, and would be obliged to keep the rates on the Beira-Salisbury line sufficiently high to allow a large portion of the imports to be brought in over the southern route, so that, in a war of rates with the Union, the ability of Rhodesia to defend itself by importing through Beira is not so great as is commonly supposed.

Transcending in importance the railway question and all others is the enduring problem of the management of the natives. No definite or settled policy appears to be followed in this territory, nor indeed is it intended to be argued that the application of a definite policy has been possible. The Chartered Company has on the whole succeeded fairly well. But the time has arrived for uniform treatment of the natives throughout the whole of South Africa. It would assuredly be in the best interests of the natives themselves. So long, however, as Rhodesia continues under the rule of the Chartered Company, the question is bound to remain in abeyance.

The Asiatic question stands on a similar footing. Whether the attitude taken up by the Dominions on this question, one of the most serious in Imperial politics,

is defensible or not, it is beyond controversy that the existence of one policy in the Union and another in Rhodesia must inevitably lead to trouble in the long run. Feeling in Rhodesia is entirely in accord with that of the rest of South Africa; yet it is well known that, under the Charter, no legislation on the lines of anything existing in the Union or likely to become law there in the future would be sanctioned by the Imperial Government. Proof of this has already been given. An Ordinance passed by the Legislative Council in 1908 regulating Asiatic immigration was disallowed by the Secretary of State. Thus the Asiatic question already exists in Rhodesia. It is as well to be forewarned before it becomes acute.

From the purely Rhodesian point of view, Union would bring other advantages, such as the settlement of all outstanding differences between the settlers and the Chartered Company, e.g. the dispute as to the ownership of the land, the proper allocation of revenues between the commercial and administrative sides of the Company, and many other questions which it would be tedious to notice in detail. From the Imperial point of view there can be but one opinion. If South Africa is to be a strength to the Empire and not a weakness, unity and brotherly love must prevail throughout its length and breadth. The population of Rhodesia is essentially British. There are no racial difficulties here. But surely they confess to a cramped imperialism who for that reason would dissuade Rhodesians from joining hands with the South.

One objection to Union has been held over. This is the place to examine it. Notwithstanding all that has been said in favour of Union, there is an obstacle, and from the Rhodesian point of view an almost insurmountable obstacle, to the immediate transference of the administration from the Chartered Company to the Union Government. No one would wish the country to be brought into the Union in opposition to the wishes of the people. Section 150 of the South Africa Act provides for the entrance of Rhodesia into the Union simply on addresses to the King from the Houses of Parliament of the Union; but it is hardly conceivable that such a step would be taken without some previous

indication of the willingness of the Rhodesian community to be taken into the partnership. There has been no advocate of Union who has not declared the will and free consent of Rhodesians to such a step to be essential and has not also claimed for Rhodesia the fullest liberty to make terms for herself. No machinery exists by which the community, apart from the Chartered Company, can enter into negotiations with the Union Government on its own account. But there seems no reason to doubt that, if such machinery existed, terms might be arranged which would be acceptable to a majority of the population. It is conceivable, for example, that on the language question a special set of provisions might be made applicable to Rhodesia; or the matter might be left to the decision of the Rhodesian Provincial Council. In these circumstances it is worth while considering whether there is not a good deal to be said for a suggestion recently made, that the Imperial Government should make use of its prerogative under section 33 of the Charter to terminate the administrative powers of the Company, and in doing so should transfer them to a Provisional Government responsible to the Crown, in which the settlers would be thoroughly represented, such Government being charged with the duty of entering into negotiations with the Union Government for the purpose of ascertaining the most favourable terms on which the inclusion of Rhodesia would be accepted. The terms being ascertained, a proposal for the admission of Rhodesia would be submitted to the people and their wishes ascertained by some means to be provided for in the constitution of the Provisional Government. In the event of its acceptance, Rhodesia would at once take up its place as one of the provinces of the Union. In the contrary event, the Imperial Government would be obliged to prolong the life of the Provisional Government for a term of years and, if necessary, from time to time for further terms of years, until the progress of the country became such as to entitle it to claim the full privileges and responsibilities of self-government or to reconsider its decision to remain out of the Union.

H. T. LONGDEN.

Art. 13.—AIRCRAFT IN WAR.

ALMOST unheeded, a momentous conflict is raging amongst the Powers. The first chapter of another volume of the 'next' war has been started. In the European campaign of to-morrow aerial supremacy will probably prove to be the dominant factor. That supremacy will be gained in peace. Salient and vital in this peace-strategy, this 'war of preparation,' is the contest for the air. Are we forward in the struggle? Let us consider briefly some of the many factors and components involved in the further development of military aviation.

The term 'aerial supremacy' is not, as is inferred by large sections of the press and by the man in the street, synonymous with numerical superiority in aircraft. The fact that military aviation means a combination of organisation, training, and materiel is often overlooked. To gain the true criterion of aerial strength, equal weight must be given to training of personnel, to ground organisation, and to the supply and maintenance of the best possible materiel. An air service lacking good ground arrangements is more seriously handicapped than is a fleet without bases.

In the air, as on land and at sea, advantage is with numbers; but, as we have recently seen in France, numbers alone do not denote aerial strength. A national subscription of about a quarter of a million was raised in France last year to promote military aviation. To encourage the home industry (and perhaps to gain public favour), part of this sum was spent on the purchase of 170 aeroplanes of various French marks. The Press then proudly declared that so many hundreds of aeroplanes were available for war purposes, and the public was assured of French predominance. When taken into army use, however, many of the machines were found to be out of date. Further, their multiplicity of types, involving a multiplicity of spare parts, rendered efficient ground organisation impossible. It is even doubtful whether many of them will be retained in the French Air Service. The move may have had its political value; the actual gain to the service was comparatively small.

The principle emphasised is that the fewer the types

or designs of aircraft used in a flying corps the better; and standardisation within those designs must be rigidly adhered to. British organisation is based upon this principle. Before proceeding to a detailed examination of its development, it will be useful to glance at the types and characteristics of existing aircraft.

The main classes of aircraft for military purposes are airships, aeroplanes, and kites. The radius of action of the latest airships is approximately 1000 miles, though theoretically their range is greater. Their speed is from 40 to 50 miles an hour in still air, and they have a lifting power of from 20 to 30 tons. This leaves a useful margin for crew and light armament. Airships can hover, and they afford an excellent all-round view. Owing to their ability to remain in the air for many hours, if necessary without the assistance of a motor, they are excellent for night work; and their long-range wireless equipment renders them very valuable for distant reconnaissance. On the other hand, they are vulnerable to fire owing to their size, and they require a well-trained ground personnel for safe landing.

Aeroplanes normally have a tankage capacity of about 200 miles and a speed of from 60 to 90 miles an hour. When in flight their vulnerability to fire is small. The rate of climbing of an average machine is from four to five hundred feet a minute. This is a slower rate than that of the vertical rise of an airship, but aeroplanes can attain to heights quite impossible to airships. Both aeroplanes and airships deteriorate if left in the open, but the former less rapidly than the latter. At present the principal rôle of the aeroplane is reconnaissance by day. The engine is still not sufficiently reliable to permit of practical night work.

Kites are of value for the observation of artillery fire. They support an observer and his carrier at from 1500 to 2000 feet, from which height fire may be directed by means of a telephone. Kites cannot easily be damaged by hostile artillery; but they have the great disadvantage that they can only be used in steady winds ranging from about 20 to 40 miles an hour. Balloons, though not used in war, have considerable value in the preliminary training of pilots and observers in airmanship and map-reading.

In this country, kites, balloons, and small dirigibles were till recently handled on a very limited scale and in a tentative manner by Balloon Companies, and by the late Air Battalion of the Royal Engineers. These units were unfortunately much handicapped by lack of public interest and funds; and it was not until early in 1912, when the progress of aviation abroad was brought home to the authorities, that the first serious steps to form a suitable air service were taken. There were at that time very few data upon which to base a detailed organisation; each of the Powers was endeavouring to form an air service, but that of France alone had materialised sufficiently to afford useful help. Since then the French organisation has undergone many changes. A Council has recently been formed to advise the War Ministry on questions of scientific research, industrial enterprise, and military aeronautics.

In principle, the air service of France now consists of three lines—frontier, reserve and training. The further organisation appears to be somewhat indefinite, but it is understood that the formation of two regiments, of three battalions each, is proposed. The 'escadrilles' of these battalions will be distributed among certain specified centres. It is probable that each centre will have ten 'escadrilles' and their reserves. The number of aeroplanes per 'escadrille' has hitherto been six, with two more in reserve. It is reported that a Government aircraft factory is shortly to be formed. The French airships have until to-day been of the non-rigid and semi-rigid types, but the large rigid is now also being tried. France has at present about eleven useful airships available for war purposes, with suitably equipped bases for their employment.

The German organisation has developed somewhat differently. The Army and Navy services are distinct. The administration of the former is supervised by the Inspector-General of Military Communication Services. Under him is an Inspector with two assistants, the one dealing with heavier-than-air craft and the other with those lighter than air. The former service is organised in five battalions, each normally consisting of three companies, which are, as a rule, stationed at fortresses away from the headquarters of their battalions. In war

a number of flying units are to be formed from battalions. The units will probably each consist of six aeroplanes with their personnel and transport, and it is expected that they will be allotted to Army Corps.

In airships, Germany has a remarkable lead. This service has behind it many years of strenuous endeavour; and, as a result, there is no doubt that the Zeppelins, Schutte-Lanz, Army M type and Parsevals have attained to a high state of efficiency. The airship troops comprise six battalions. Army airship bases are situated at Berlin, Königsberg, Metz, Cologne, Mannheim, Friedrichshafen, Dresden, Düsseldorf and Munich; and many others are now being built. The naval air service is administered by the Admiralty. It has two airships in course of construction, and a number of seaplanes. A naval airship base is situated at Cuxhaven and another is, it is reported, projected on the Island of Heligoland. Seaplane stations are being established on the North Sea and Baltic.

Now to turn to the British organisation. The general outlines of that organisation are as follows: There is to be one air service consisting of a Military Wing and a Naval Wing, the idea being that either Wing shall be available to assist the other as occasion may require. There is no chief of the Air Service and its branches. The Director of the Air Department at the Admiralty administers the Naval Wing. The Director-General of Military Aeronautics at the War Office is responsible for the Military Wing, the Central Flying School, the Royal Aircraft Factory, and the Aeronautical Inspection Department. The Military Wing is to undertake all work with heavier-than-air craft, with the exception of the seaplane service mentioned below. The Naval Wing is now to be responsible for the provision of the lighter-than-air type, and for seaplanes operating directly from the fleet. The Central Flying School, paid for as to two-thirds by the War Office and as to one-third by the Admiralty, carries out the initial training of Army and Navy pilots. It is administered by the War Office and is staffed by both services. The Royal Aircraft Factory carries out experimental work. It also effects heavy repairs which are beyond the scope of the squadron workshops, or in cases where time does not permit of their being done by the

manufacturers. Aeroplanes are also constructed from time to time when special considerations require. The Inspection Branch has recently been formed with the object of inspecting aeronautical materiel, aircraft and engines, supplied for the use of the Military Wing and the Central Flying School.

The Naval Wing consists of a seaplane section, an airship section, and a naval flying school. According to the official report it possesses 62 seaplanes and 41 aeroplanes, and will complete its present establishment of 15 airships this year. Naval airship centres have not yet been formed. The principal requirements of a naval as of a military airship are long range and high speed, as distant reconnaissance will be their chief duty. They also require considerable weight-carrying capacity. It is not anticipated that much will be effected by deck attack against men-of-war, but it is quite possible that such attack by means of bombs would be effective against troop-ships. Also roadsteads and harbours might be blocked by means of mercantile shipping sunk in this manner. The Naval Flying School at Eastchurch trains those seaplane pilots who are not sent to the Central Flying School. So far no very satisfactory type of seaplane has been evolved in England or abroad. Hydro-aeroplanes for use on comparatively calm inland waters are one thing; seaplanes to negotiate even small waves are quite another.

The Military Wing is to comprise a headquarters, an aircraft park, a kite flight, and eight aeroplane squadrons for use with the Expeditionary Force. The sanctioned establishment of the Wing is 165 officers, 1264 noncommissioned officers and men, 200 aeroplanes, and a flight of kites. This establishment will be completed during the present year. There will also be a reserve of pilots. In war, the headquarters will consist of the Officer Commanding the Military Wing and his staff. The duties of this commander will be to act as technical adviser to the Commander-in-Chief, and he will also be responsible generally for the maintenance and administration of the air service. The tactical unit, an aeroplane squadron, is subdivided into a squadron headquarters and three flights, each of the latter being equipped to provide four active and three reserve aeroplanes. Each

flight is a homogeneous unit consisting of personnel, aeroplanes and transport, and certain inter-communication accessories; it is thus able to act independently of the rest of the squadron. It may in turn be subdivided into self-contained half-flights. There are seven light tenders or motor cars and nineteen heavy vehicles with a squadron in the field. This transport is organised in two echelons. The first contains first-aid detachments, tools, spare parts, fuel and oil for immediate use. The second echelon is fitted to effect heavier repairs and to carry a reserve of spare parts. The base unit of the field organisation will be the aircraft park, which will be at the advanced base or at some convenient point on the line of communication in its vicinity.

No definite rules can as yet be laid down as to the method of employing aircraft in war. The duties demanded are so various as to make it impossible for one type to fulfil all requirements. Though, however, long strategical reconnaissance demands one attribute, the tactical sphere another, and fighting in the air a third, the obvious maxim is that there must be no water-tight compartments, and all available strength must be fully employed. In the initial strategical stages, distant reconnaissance and such work as the destruction of airships will probably fall to the squadrons with the Commander-in-Chief. In the tactical phase it is likely that the majority of squadrons will be allotted to Army Corps and Divisions. The general principle in view is that the Commander-in-Chief, acting through the Commander of the Military Wing, will allot the various squadrons according to requirements and vary their distribution as the situation may demand.

In the strategical phase, aircraft will assist the Cavalry Division to locate their objective. For this purpose the most suitable type will be aeroplanes that can be easily dismantled for road transport and quickly re-erected, so that, when the weather renders flying impracticable, they may still accompany the unit to which they have been allotted. The work of the squadrons attached to General Headquarters has already been indicated. The remaining squadrons will in this phase accompany the main body, the reconnoitring aeroplanes being employed in protective reconnaissance on the

flanks, and the fighting machines in preventing the enemy's reconnaissance by attacking his air forces.

A flying corps is peculiarly dependent upon its transport. If 'an army marches on its stomach,' aircraft exist upon their 'spares.' All air-service units in the field must therefore be accompanied by their first echelons of transport. The second echelons, owing to their unwieldy proportions, will often have to remain in the rear with the heavy transport, but every possible facility will have to be given them for reinforcement. During the tactical phase the distances to be covered will be less; the squadron landing-grounds will be close in rear of the fighting troops; and it should be possible to bring parts of the second echelons to these centres. In this phase the duties of a flying corps will be many and varied. Fighting to gain information and fighting to prevent reconnaissance, observation of the progress of the battle, co-operation with the artillery, inter-communication between various headquarters—experience alone will show how the new arm is to be employed to render most efficiently these and other miscellaneous services.

At its present stage of development, the potential utility of aircraft in war may undoubtedly be summed up in the word 'reconnaissance.' Its essence is rapidity. Information may be obtained regardless of natural or artificial barriers; seldom will mountain chains, rivers or fortifications serve to screen the combinations of the strategist. The effect of aircraft will be most marked during the opening phases of a campaign, for they are peculiarly fitted for the vital service of strategical reconnaissance. But, although they will save the cavalry much labour and greatly increase its efficiency, they cannot supplant it in this rôle. Aircraft are unable to remain constantly in touch with the enemy, cannot as a rule identify individual units, and are useless in heavy rain, mist and fog.

In aerial reconnaissance the observer is as important a factor as the aircraft. In Tripoli, the Balkans, and on manœuvres it has been proved conclusively that an untrained observer is worse than useless; the observer must be a specialist. A sound knowledge of military matters is essential; and to this must be added eye for

country, natural aptitude and continuous training. The aerial scout must be so trained that he is able to recognise at a glance the units of any arm, in any formation, and estimate their numerical strength. His nerve and eyesight must be of the best; he must possess considerable stamina, for victory or defeat may depend upon his efficiency under the most adverse conditions; and his visual memory must be of a high order.

Experience teaches that climatic conditions affect observation from the air to a larger extent than was anticipated. Ground mists, which frequently occur in the early morning and evening throughout the year in many parts of Europe, may at times effectually cloak the movements of troops. Mists are also contingent to mountainous areas and to those traversed by large rivers. In the campaigns of the future it is probable that columns will seek the more mist-covered lines of advance.

The whole question of the visibility of troops in various formations in the field is an interesting one. It has been found that, under normal conditions, it is very difficult to conceal troops on the march from aircraft reconnoitring by day. The plan of halting and taking cover whenever an aeroplane engine is heard has proved to be impracticable. It entails constant delay and increased fatigue for the troops; and various items of transport which accompany a column cannot usually be hidden. Deployed infantry, if they remain motionless, cannot easily be picked up at safe reconnoitring heights of 3000 feet and over, though much depends upon the background as seen from the observer's point of view. Troops may be effectually concealed in billets, provided that the horses and transport are carefully hidden; and during the recent manoeuvres the troops of the 4th Division were on several occasions successful in escaping notice when in bivouac.

Experiments in this country tend to show that entrenchments will be difficult to hide from aircraft unless carefully toned to their surroundings. The Italian aircraft in Tripoli discovered trenches which, owing to careful disguise, were not visible from below. Photography will obviously be a great aid to aerial reconnaissance, particularly as regards field-works and permanent fortifications. Photographs taken from aeroplanes have

hitherto been developed on the ground; the process occupies about seven minutes, and an enlarged print may be obtained in an additional ten minutes.

Among the more important aspects of aerial reconnaissance is that of observation of artillery fire. Although kites and captive balloons are in some respects suitable for this service, they have the great disadvantage of not being mobile. During an engagement, artillery units may frequently be required to move, and their assistant reconnaissance services must move with them. For these purposes, the aeroplane, being the swiftest and least vulnerable of aircraft, is now generally employed. The information obtained may be conveyed to the guns either by smoke puffs or signal lights discharged from the aeroplane when it is immediately above the target. Another method is to drop an enlarged map; or, again, the aeroplane may return in a straight line from the target to the battery, and thus indicate the necessary direction, the range then being obtained by bracket fire assisted by further aerial observation.

One of the chief difficulties in the co-operation of aeroplanes with artillery is that of rapid inter-communication. The same difficulty presents itself when aeroplanes are co-operating with other troops. The solution seems to lie in the successful installation of wireless in this type of aircraft. At present aeroplanes transmit their information either by dropping messages or by returning to earth. Both these systems have disadvantages. The first entails the risk of the message being lost through falling into water, or amongst trees, scrub, high grass, etc.; the second entails delay, as headquarters may be constantly on the move, and suitable landing-ground in the vicinity may not be available. Officers will be appointed for the special work of selecting and marking landing-grounds. A system of indicating landing-places for various aircraft has already been evolved. For the average aeroplane a field 200 yards square (about 9 acres) is sufficient if the ground is fairly level and hard. The larger the field, the better; but it is interesting to note that small fields, which preclude the landing of swift, high-powered machines, are often quite suitable for the landing of slower-flying craft. The requirements for an airship landing-place are not

quite the same as those for an aeroplane. Under normal weather conditions an area 50 per cent. larger than the airship is sufficient; but the spot chosen must be accessible for motor transport, and shelter from the prevailing winds is essential for safety, unless a mooring mast is available. The selection of ground suitable for the flying of man-lifting kites is often difficult. The site must be free from obstacles and have a clear space 600 to 1000 yards in length for safe hauling-in. It is possible to haul down in a smaller space, but this involves considerable preparation.

The various points bearing on the utility of aircraft in reconnaissance have been dwelt on, because reconnaissance is, at present, pre-eminently their rôle. Indications are, however, not lacking that they are destined to play another and equally important rôle in warfare. Fighting aircraft must now be considered. The problems inherent in the question of aerial warfare are numerous and complex. They may perhaps be best considered under two heads, first, aerial warfare proper, that is the action of aircraft against aircraft in the air; and, second, the action of aircraft against troops, transport, bases, etc., on the ground.

With regard to the first, there are no data upon which to base conclusions. Inferences can only be drawn from the apparent battle-value of the various types. Airships are armed with small quick-firing guns, machine-guns, automatic rifles and bombs; and the same type of armament may also be used in aeroplanes. As already mentioned, the airship when opposed to aeroplanes will probably have the advantage of fire superiority owing to its heavier armament and comparatively large 'platform stability,' but on the other hand its envelope affords a large and extremely vulnerable target. Owing to its ability to ascend vertically and swiftly, it will, during the first phases of the combat, be able to obtain and maintain 'position,' but eventually its slower-climbing assailants will be able to rise above it. In this case, if the airship has no gun mounted on the top, its whole armament will be defiladed by its envelope. In a running fight, however, advantage will, to some extent, be with the airship owing to its superiority in air-duration.

It does not seem probable that pitched battles will take place between fleets of such aeroplanes as now exist. Their radius of action is limited, and they cannot keep the air indefinitely while waiting for their scouts to bring back information as to the enemy's whereabouts. Owing to lack of facilities for inter-communication, cohesion in an aeroplane fleet would be difficult to maintain, and manœuvre under a single commander would be impossible. It is probable therefore, that after the first onset the battle will resolve itself into a series of combats between small units or single machines. Airships undoubtedly possess an advantage in the fact that their wireless installation facilitates control, and hence concerted action. It seems probable that they will endeavour to fight in flotillas or fleets, to ensure mutual support and utilise their superior gun-power.

With regard to the second head, that of aircraft acting against troops on the ground, the data, though of a negative character, and referring only to bomb-dropping, are interesting. Bombs were dropped from aircraft both in the Balkans and in Tripoli. The actual results in both cases were negligible. For instance, a Bulgarian aeroplane is reported to have dropped thirty bombs into Adrianople in one day, and the resulting casualties were only six. Bomb-dropping will, of course, be more effective from airships than from aeroplanes, but the speed of both renders it very difficult to hit any object aimed at from a safe height. Though the obstacles are being gradually overcome, troops on the ground are still little vulnerable to aircraft attack. The probable result of aircraft attack is, then, as yet chiefly moral. When the various types of fighting aircraft are evolved and their armaments and methods of attack perfected, the results will be very real. Aircraft will then carry the attack into the strategical zone, and perhaps beyond it. Troops in mass, on the march, in camp and in bivouac, ammunition and supply parks, arsenals, dockyards, naval and aircraft bases,—these will be some of the targets selected.

The duties of aircraft in future campaigns will be numerous and widely divergent in character, and, as already indicated, various classes of machine will be required for their performance. We may soon have

to consider such problems as the types of craft best suited for work with the Cavalry, with Headquarters of the Army, and with Flanking Divisions; the type best adapted to the requirements of a battle squadron, of a low-flying armoured destroyer, of a scout flotilla, and possibly of transport convoy and repair craft. The forerunners of these fighting aircraft are already with us; weight-lifting aeroplanes and giant airships are flying to-day. Large as these machines may now appear, they will certainly be dwarfed by the aircraft of the future, for many desirable features are enhanced with increase of size.

The evolution of the most suitable types of aircraft is the phase in the struggle for air supremacy upon which we are now entering. In the matter of design and construction of aeroplanes, in personnel and in organisation, Great Britain undoubtedly leads. That lead can only be maintained by sustained and strenuous effort. There can be no question that, both from the military and the commercial point of view, aerial supremacy is within our reach. Will she but make the effort, England may be mistress of the air as she is of the seas. The provision of numbers must be faced. Vast issues are at stake; and it is surely unthinkable that the opportunity will be lost. In the sphere of aeronautics it is more difficult than in others to regain ground. The time is at hand when even feverish effort will not avail, but to-day we may take the lead with comparative ease, and once gained it should not be difficult to retain. The expenditure entailed would be very slight in comparison to the sums spent on those other types of national insurance, the Army and Navy. The entire vote for the Air Service for the current year would not purchase a single Dreadnought, yet there can be no doubt that the expenditure represents a better insurance return. From the point of view of national safety, a paramount air service is the most economical form of national insurance.

F. H. SYKES.

Art. 14.—THE HOME RULE CRISIS.

1. *Correspondence relating to recent events in the Irish Command.* (Cd 7318.)
2. *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 1914.
3. *Reports of Speeches by Ministers and Opposition Leaders*, Jan.—April, 1914.

THE possibility of finding a way out of the Home Rule crisis by a national settlement was discussed in the January number of this Review. The conclusion then arrived at was that such a settlement could only be attained if the leaders of both parties could muster the courage to make an entirely fresh start, to summon a national convention selected on non-party lines, and to submit to that convention for discussion and decision not only the question of the creation of some system of provincial government in the United Kingdom, but also that of the reconstitution and reorganisation of our whole legislative machinery. It was felt that no attempt at a settlement could be really successful which ignored the intimate interaction of the Parliament Act upon the Home Rule situation. Even more strongly expressed was the conviction that the attempt to find a settlement in a compromise on some portion of the Home Rule Bill, and in particular with regard to the position of Ulster, was predestined to failure from the outset, and, even if temporarily successful, could afford no cure for the evils of the body politic and no guarantee against the speedy recurrence of the crisis. The discussion of the exclusion of Ulster, in any shape or form, was earnestly deprecated, not only as unsatisfactory in itself, but as furnishing the worst hope of peace, if the party leaders were really anxious for peace, and not merely manœuvring for position and looking for opportunities to advertise their own extreme moderation and the unreasonableness and obstinacy of their opponents.

The course of events in the last three months has fully justified the apprehensions then expressed. The method of settlement on national lines and over the whole field of controversy seems to have been ruled out from the first by the Government, as inconsistent with its avowed resolve to place the present Home Rule Bill on the Statute Book under the Parliament Act. The

exclusion of Ulster has been the one subject of negotiation. And the only result, so far, of three months of private and public bargaining and disputation, is a complete deadlock over a proposal which is wholly unacceptable to Ulster and thoroughly distasteful to the Irish Nationalists, and which, if accepted, would mean years of administrative chaos in Ireland and of political chaos in the United Kingdom. And while the outstanding difference between the two parties over this proposal would seem, at the first glance, to be reduced to a very narrow margin, there has been not the slightest real approximation in the point of view, and the gulf remains as deep as ever.

Meanwhile the development of the crisis towards its culmination has been full of significant features and of dramatic interludes. The actual course of the 'conversations' which took place between the Prime Minister and Mr Bonar Law and Sir E. Carson during December and January last remains a secret. But the fact that they had not succeeded in coming to any agreement was a matter of general knowledge long before it was officially proclaimed in the King's Speech on February 10. That document referred to the crisis in terms of unprecedented seriousness and anxiety :

'In a matter in which the hopes and the fears of so many of My subjects are keenly concerned, and which, unless handled now with foresight, judgment, and in the spirit of mutual concession, threatens grave future difficulties, it is My most earnest wish that the good will and co-operation of men of all parties and creeds may heal dissension and lay the foundation of a lasting settlement.'

Language such as this might well have preluded a generous offer to deal with the whole problem on national and non-party lines. But, judging from the subsequent conduct of the Government, it is difficult to see with what object it was introduced into the King's Speech, except that of creating a conciliatory atmosphere in which it might be easier for the Government to gain time while in effect pushing ahead with its programme. Mr Asquith, in the debate on the Address, after allusions which indicated, with studied vagueness, that the exclusion of Ulster in some form or other might be in

contemplation, announced that the Government would take the responsibility of making positive suggestions at some early date after the necessary financial business of the year had been disposed of.

This piece of purely dilatory tactics was received with resentment and dismay not only by the official Opposition but in wide circles outside. Among detached students, as well as among active party men, the conviction spread that Mr Asquith's main object was not to secure agreement, but to keep down the political temperature in England so that any outbreak of resistance in Ulster against the impending menace of Home Rule should find England unprepared and unsympathetic, and that the task of coercing Ulster should, to that extent, be facilitated. The obvious corollary to that conclusion was the need for rousing public opinion in Great Britain to the essentially unconstitutional character of the whole Government policy and to the outrageous denial of political justice involved in the treatment of Ulster, and for making it clear to the Government that the policy of coercing Ulster would encounter the most formidable resistance, moral and if necessary even material, in Great Britain as well as in Ulster itself. It was not long before this view crystallised itself into definite action.

On March 3 a remarkable letter was published in the press appealing to the people of Great Britain to give the lie to the assertion of general apathy on the issue of Home Rule by joining in the following declaration.

'Being earnestly convinced that the claim of the Government to carry the Home Rule Bill into law, without submitting it to the judgment of the nation, is contrary to the spirit of our Constitution, we do hereby solemnly declare that, if that Bill is so passed, we shall hold ourselves justified in taking or supporting any action that may be effective to prevent it being put into operation, and more particularly to prevent the armed forces of the Crown being used to deprive the people of Ulster of their rights as citizens of the United Kingdom.'

The object of this declaration, as the letter explained, was not to pledge the signatories to any particular action of which, at a given moment, their conscience and judgment did not approve, but to strengthen in their own minds their 'fixed intention and resolve to do whatever

they individually can to prevent the disruption of the United Kingdom by unconstitutional methods, and the injustice and oppression which it would entail,' and to warn the Government of the consequences which must result not only in Ireland, but in Great Britain from persistence in their policy. To this letter was appended a list of twenty signatures, which included some of the most prominent leaders of thought and action in every department of our national life outside the sphere of ordinary party politics. Two names among them stood out as recalling the memory of the last great crisis in the fate of the British Empire, the name of Lord Roberts who saved South Africa on the field, and of Lord Milner who faced without flinching the issue of British or Dutch supremacy, and who, after the war, laid the foundations of a new South Africa on the ruins of the old.

The demonstration of April 4 showed that the Covenant movement has focussed public attention on the crisis, and has infused a sterner temper and a more national complexion into the Unionist opposition to the Home Rule Bill.

Meanwhile the obvious irritation, both inside and outside the House of Commons, at the policy of masterly silence, was not without its influence on Mr Asquith, and led to his acceptance of an offer from the Opposition to facilitate the passage of the necessary financial business if he would produce his proposals at an earlier date. On March 9 he produced, with his customary impressiveness, the following scheme: that there should be a referendum held in Ulster by counties and county boroughs on the question of exclusion from the Home Rule Bill, and that those areas which voted for exclusion should be provisionally excluded for a term of six years, after which they would be automatically included. As a means to a settlement the proposal was derisory; as a manœuvre for position it was by no means unskilful. The county basis for the proposed referendum is plausible enough for English platform purposes. It requires some knowledge of the distribution of the electorate in Ulster to realise that a referendum so arranged would exclude from the Ulster community not only the scattered outlying Unionist minorities in Donegal, Cavan, and

Monaghan, but the great solid and prosperous body of Ulstermen in Tyrone, Fermanagh, and even in Londonderry City itself, bound by inseparable ties to the rest of the Ulster community, more ardently opposed to Home Rule than Belfast itself and no less effectively organised for resistance, comprising practically the whole wealth and intelligence of those areas, but falling short, by an insignificant fraction, of being an actual numerical majority at a poll. In that aspect the proposal involves, in fact, a direct denial of the existence of the Ulster Protestants as a single coherent community. Similarly the six years' limit can plausibly be defended on the platform as a reasonable concession to Nationalist sentiment, while giving Ulster the opportunity of at least two elections, after which the automatic inclusion might be rescinded if the experience of the working of Home Rule failed to allay Ulster apprehensions. In fact, it would mean, for a mutilated Ulster, the intolerable task of keeping alive in Ulster itself and in British politics the whole issue which it is the professed object of the Home Rule Bill to lay at rest, while incidentally it would commit the Nationalist representatives at Westminster and the Irish Nationalist organisation in the great British cities to another six years' continuance of the existing political alliance. And from the point of view of principle, the time limit involves the denial of the whole contention for which Ulster is fighting, namely, the right of the Ulster community, in any rearrangement of government in the United Kingdom, to be free to decide its own destiny. Lastly, the slightest examination of the proposed scheme shows that it is utterly unworkable from the administrative point of view. The conflict of jurisdiction on such matters as customs, postal services, railways, labour and social legislation of all kinds, which would be involved, can be realised by imagining what would happen in the case of Londonderry, which would probably be included in Home Rule Ireland, but be separated from Donegal on the one side by a three-mile strip of County Derry which would vote for exclusion, and by a slightly wider strip from Tyrone on the other.

It is difficult to believe that the Government can have expected their proposal to meet with any other answer

than an instant and indignant rejection, which would undoubtedly have been very convenient for their purposes. If so they were disappointed. Both Mr Bonar Law and Sir E. Carson refrained from the obvious temptation to tear the proposal to tatters, and, while generally treating it as inadequate, concentrated their criticism on the six years' time limit. It is probable that the Unionist leaders knew that the proposal was extremely unpopular with the Ulster Nationalists, with whom Mr Devlin, during the days immediately preceding, had had to exercise his utmost powers of persuasion; and that, in regard to the time limit in particular, the period of six years was an amendment at the last moment upon a three years' limit, which was all that Mr Devlin had been able to induce his friends to accept. They guessed, too, that the importance of the time limit in Nationalist eyes would not be appreciated by the Liberal rank and file who might be inclined to agree to waive it. They were right, in so far as both the bulk of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons and the Liberal Press next day treated Sir E. Carson's offer to go over to Ulster and lay the proposal before his people, if only the time limit were removed, as eminently reasonable. But they were wrong if they hoped for any positive result, for the Nationalist and official screw was immediately put on, and within two days both Press and Party had swung into line again in upholding the sacrosanctity of the time limit and denouncing the irreconcilable perversity of the Opposition.

The whole Government attitude, in fact, hardened with a suddenness and aggressiveness for which the speeches of the Unionist leaders had provided no sufficient warrant, so far as the public could then judge, but which is, perhaps, more intelligible in the light of what has since become known. On Saturday, March 14, Mr Churchill delivered an uncompromising and menacing speech at Bradford, in which he declared that, if Ulster rejected the Government offer, it could only be because it preferred shooting to voting; and that, if it took any 'unconstitutional action,' that would be regarded as unprovoked aggression and would be dealt with by the Government without compunction. 'The first British

soldier or coastguard, bluejacket or Irish Constabularyman who is attacked and killed by an Orangeman will rouse an explosion in this country.' There were 'worse things than bloodshed, even on an extensive scale.' Concluding with a direct challenge to 'all the loose, wanton and reckless chatter' of those who had talked of resistance, he asked his supporters to 'go forward together and put these grave matters to the proof.' On the following day Mr Devlin, also at Bradford, poured his contempt upon Ulster resistance as 'a sham, a fraud, a humbug, a piece of audacious bluff.' On the 16th Mr Asquith not only dismissed a long series of Unionist questions as to the actual working of his proposal with contemptuous brevity, but deliberately expressed his approval of the tone and substance of the Bradford speech. On the 17th Mr Redmond announced that 'force was to be met with force.' It was an open secret during the next few days that conferences were being held at the War Office to discuss the taking of military measures with regard to Ulster. Sir E. Carson in the vote of censure debate on Thursday, March 19, referred to them, and, in concluding his speech, made a declaration which is not without significance in view of the events of the next twenty-four hours:

'I have never asked that the Army should not be sent there. I have never asked that the Army should not do its duty when it is sent there. I hope and expect it will. . . . Perhaps you will consider before you go what will be the effect upon the Army.'

Since then the public has learnt, bit by bit, the amazing story of the contemplated military and naval *coup* against Ulster to which the Bradford speech and the whole public attitude of certain Ministers were evidently meant to lead up. How far the Government was really under the impression that an outbreak in Ulster was imminent, or how far the true explanation is that certain Ministers, and in particular Mr Churchill, had convinced themselves that the Ulster Volunteer organisation was becoming so formidable that the only chance of dealing with it was to crush it by a sudden Napoleonic stroke before it gained yet greater cohesion, and before the British movement in support of Ulster had time

to crystallise into any effective organisation—to these questions no answer is so far available. Nor is it clear even now whether any Ministers, or what Ministers, besides Mr Churchill and Colonel Seely, really understood the full scope of what was in progress. The reader must draw his own deductions from the ascertained facts.

So early as March 11 the Cabinet appear to have sanctioned the stationing of a battle squadron at Lamlash, opposite the Ulster coast, where they would be 'conveniently situated in case of grave disorder arising.' On March 14, in pursuance of a decision of the Cabinet, or rather of a small inner body of Ministers, consisting of Lord Crewe, Sir J. Simon, Mr Churchill and Colonel Seely, who were charged with considering the Ulster situation, a War Office letter was sent to Sir Arthur Paget, Commander-in-Chief in Ireland, drawing his attention to the possibility of an attempt being made to seize the arms and other Government stores at the dépôts at Armagh, Omagh, Carrickfergus, and Enniskillen, and asking him to take the necessary steps and report. On March 17 Sir A. Paget reported that Enniskillen was already guarded by a company of the Cheshire Regiment, that he was strengthening the small detachment guarding Carrickfergus, and that he was taking steps to remove the reserve arms and ammunition from Armagh and Omagh to Dublin and Enniskillen respectively. He had considered the alternative policy of providing extra guards for Armagh and Omagh from the Bedfordshire Regiment at Mullingar, but had rejected it because:

'in the present state of the country I am of opinion that any such move of troops would create intense excitement in Ulster and possibly precipitate a crisis. For these reasons I do not consider myself justified in moving troops at the present time.'

This modest and unprovocative policy was duly put into effect. Guards were doubled at Enniskillen. On Wednesday, the 18th, the detachment of the Norfolks at Carrickfergus was reinforced by a few additional men from the main body of the regiment stationed at Holywood just across Belfast Lough. The stores at Armagh and Omagh were packed in readiness for sending away.

Meanwhile Sir A. Paget had been summoned to the War Office, and spent the 18th and 19th in consultation with his military chiefs, and more particularly with Colonel Seely and Mr Churchill. The outcome of these discussions was the complete overriding of the modest programme then in course of being carried out, and the substitution of a plan of a very different character. Strong detachments were to be sent to Armagh, Omagh and Enniskillen. Troops were to be hurried by sea from Dublin to Carrickfergus by two cruisers ordered round from Berehaven. So far, these movements, however provocative, as judged by General Paget's standard, in the method of their execution, might be said to have at least a precautionary object. But they were only part of a plan which was obviously purely strategic and offensive, and which contemplated, not the possibility of stores being raided by 'evil-disposed persons,' but war against Ulster on a large scale. The preliminary moves of this plan—the only ones actually carried out—included the despatch of a battalion to Dundalk and Newry, where there were no stores to guard, but a most important gateway into Ulster to be seized, and the removing of the Dorsets from Belfast, with all their stores, to join the Norfolks at Holywood, where, in conjunction with the troops at Carrickfergus, and with naval help, they could close up Belfast Lough and be in a good position for an effective attack upon the city. The main military moves were, apparently, to include the seizure of the bridges across the Boyne by the 3rd Cavalry Brigade from the Curragh, followed by the advance upon Ulster of the whole of the troops in the rest of Ireland, assisted, if necessary, by an additional division from England. The same day, Thursday March 19, orders were sent to the 3rd Battle Squadron, on its way back from Spain, to proceed to Lamlash, while orders for the same destination were given to the Fourth Destroyer Flotilla at Southampton. The whole operation, involving some 25,000 troops and a large naval force, was one of the most formidable ever contemplated by this country in any war.

It has since been maintained by Ministers that the moves actually carried out on March 20 and 21 were simply in pursuance of the War Office letter of the 14th,

and that all the other operations were purely precautionary, and contingent upon resistance being offered to the preliminary movements. It is very difficult to accept this theory. As has already been shown, some of the moves actually carried out had no relation at all to any question raised in the letter of the 14th, but were purely strategical. How far, but for certain events still to be related, the remaining moves would have been carried in the absence of direct opposition from Ulster it is impossible to say. What is obvious is that, in the state of tension then existing, and deliberately fomented by the Bradford speech and by the whole attitude of Ministers and their Nationalist friends, even the movements actually carried out must be regarded as dangerously provocative, and directly calculated to evoke, at some point or other, that resistance which would have afforded the pretext for the immediate carrying through of the whole scheme for the subjugation of Ulster. There can be no more striking contrast than that presented, on the one side, by the infinite hesitation of the British Government in the summer of 1899 to send out reinforcements to South Africa, then practically defenceless, owing to its reluctance to compromise the faint hopes of a peaceful settlement with the Boers by even the shadow of provocative or coercive measures, and, on the other, by the precipitate and wantonly ostentatious character of the measures devised by British Ministers, in the present instance, against their own fellow-countrymen. One thing at any rate seems clear from all the evidence, public and private, which has reached us. General Paget crossed over to Ireland on the night of the 19th, fully convinced that he was almost immediately to take part in a serious military campaign.

In all this business there was one element of doubt which exercised the mind of the Ministers concerned in organising the great plan, and that was the possibility of the troops refusing to fight against the Ulstermen. That the men would do what their officers told them was assumed as a matter of course. But that the officers not only profoundly resented the idea of being asked to coerce Ulster, but might in many cases send in their resignations, or practically fail to execute orders, while nominally obeying them, was a contingency which could

not be left out of account. The way of meeting the difficulty which seems to have commended itself to Colonel Seely or to the War Office authorities was that of a preliminary purge of the most disaffected. General Paget was apparently instructed—it is not possible to speak more definitely, as the Government have steadfastly refused to produce General Paget's instructions—to sound his officers and lay before them the following conditions: Officers domiciled in Ulster were to be allowed to disappear till after the operations were over and would be reinstated later; other officers could choose between taking part in possible active operations against Ulster or being dismissed the service and forfeiting their pensions. The underlying assumption, one must imagine, was that, faced with so odious an alternative as loss of their whole career, the great majority would comply and feel henceforward definitely committed to any action required of them, while a small but dangerous minority would be weeded out before the trouble began. The whole proceeding was morally unjustifiable, indefensible from the point of view of military discipline, and, as the event showed, based on a profound miscalculation as to the temper of the men concerned.

General Paget summoned his senior officers to meet him on his return to Dublin on the morning of Friday, March 20. The first whom he saw was Brigadier-General Hubert Gough, commanding the 3rd Cavalry Brigade at the Curragh. One of the most distinguished junior officers in the Army, with the certainty of a brilliant career before him, General Gough without a moment's hesitation decided to take the alternative of dismissal for himself, but returned to the Curragh to place the War Office instructions before his officers. A few hours later he reported that his officers were anxious for further information. He and all of them were prepared to carry out the duty of maintaining order and preserving property in Ulster. But if the duty ordered by the War Office involved 'the *initiation* of active military operations against Ulster' fifty-nine out of a total of seventy-two officers in the Brigade 'would respectfully, and under protest, prefer to be dismissed,' while of the remainder five claimed exemption on the ground of being domiciled in Ulster. The fact that

General Paget, instead of explaining that no aggressive movement against Ulster was in contemplation, simply telegraphed to the War Office the number of officers preferring to accept dismissal 'if ordered north,' leaves little doubt as to the character of the movements in contemplation. Meanwhile General Paget had addressed the rest of his Generals of Division and Brigade, informing them that 'active operations were to be begun against Ulster; that he expected the country to be in a blaze by Saturday,' and laying before them the conditions already referred to for submission to their officers. This was done by the Generals in question on the afternoon of the 20th and morning of the 21st. That a large number of officers was prepared to follow the line taken by the Cavalry Brigade is certain; but in view of the abandonment of the plan of campaign, no information on the point has been made public.

The news about the Cavalry Brigade reached the War Office before midnight on Friday the 20th. The Ulster campaign was now clearly impossible. Whatever further military movements were in contemplation were stopped, while both the 3rd Battle Squadron and the Destroyer Flotilla were intercepted and recalled by wireless next day. The immediate problem now was what to do with the wholly unforeseen eventuality which had arisen. General Paget was immediately instructed to refuse all resignations, and to send over General Gough and his commanding officers to report themselves at the War Office, and was informed that other officers were being sent to take over their commands. The first idea undoubtedly was to make a drastic example of General Gough and any others who might be considered as 'ringleaders.' But before the week-end was over the Army Council and Ministers realised that, if that course were persisted in, there would be no War Office and very little British Army left next day.

The British Army is an institution with an intense corporate feeling, and with an outlook of its own. To politics in the ordinary sense it has always been supremely indifferent, and nothing could be more remote from the truth than the legend to which even Ministers have condescended to give currency, of an army of Tory leanings seduced into active disloyalty by two years of

Tory intrigues. But the fact remains that a proposal such as that contained in the Home Rule Bill, dividing and weakening the nation, setting up in power in Ireland a body of men who have in the past habitually declared their hatred of Great Britain and of the British Empire, and forcibly transferring to their rule the most ardently patriotic section of the whole United Kingdom, was inevitably bound to run counter to all the national instincts of a national army. In this respect there has not been, nor is there ever likely to be, any difference in point of view between officers and men, or between the present corps of officers and any more 'democratic' body that might supersede them. No army, except one of foreign mercenaries, could ever be neutral on such an issue. To ask the Army to coerce Ulster in pursuance of a purely partisan manoeuvre in the House of Commons was, as Lord Wolseley pointed out in 1893, to ask of it something that would wreck it for a generation. In this present crisis the Army had very sensibly refused to anticipate an issue which it hoped might never arise. The question of individual resignations in case of operations against Ulster was no doubt discussed at mess and in military clubs during last winter. But the general opinion throughout the Army was rightly against any hypothetical raising of the issue between conscience and military duty. The news of the events at the Curragh suddenly brought the Army face to face with the reality of that issue. There was no need for discussion, still less for any attempt at organising opinion; it was immediately clear that the Army as a whole was with General Gough and his officers, and that any attempt to punish them and to press on with the policy of coercion would be followed by the immediate and wholesale resignation of practically the whole corps of Regular officers, and probably by the bulk of the Territorial officers as well.

The Government did the only thing it could do in the circumstances. It capitulated, and in order to save its face attempted to explain that the whole affair was an 'honest misunderstanding,' that General Paget had misinterpreted his instructions, and that no operations against Ulster, nothing in fact beyond the instructions in the War Office letter of the 14th, had ever been intended. At a War Office conference on Monday the

23rd General Gough was asked to go back to his command and assured by Colonel Seely that the Government had no intention whatever of taking advantage of its right to protect the civil power, whenever attacked or wherever attacked, in order to crush political opposition to Home Rule in Ulster. This was put in writing as an Army Council memorandum and submitted to the Cabinet, which met immediately afterwards. What precisely took place is to a large extent a matter of inference. Colonel Seely must obviously have laid the whole position before his colleagues; and presumably such of them as were not already fully informed then realised the necessities of the situation. All the same, while Colonel Seely went across to Buckingham Palace, the Cabinet seems to have decided to cut out of the memorandum the passage embodying the verbal assurance already given; and, when Colonel Seely returned just before the Cabinet broke up, he found the curtailed memorandum containing nothing more than a statement that there had been a misunderstanding, and that there had been no intention of putting to officers any point beyond that of their duty to obey lawful commands for the protection of public property or the support of the civil power. This clearly was not a fulfilment of the assurance already given, without which Colonel Seely knew General Gough would not accept reinstatement. Any doubt Colonel Seely might possibly have felt on that score was removed by a letter from General Gough to the Adjutant General, which he found on his return to the Cabinet, asking that the letter he was to take back to his officers should, in order to avoid renewed misconceptions, make it quite clear whether references to the maintenance of law and order did, or did not, cover the enforcing of the Home Rule Bill upon Ulster, in the event of its becoming law.

It is incredible that the Cabinet had decided on a direct reversal of the policy of giving way and reinstating General Gough, and that Colonel Seely was not informed. In fact, the speeches of Ministers in both Houses that afternoon showed clearly that the Government line was that there had been a misunderstanding, and that there was no idea of the military coercion of Ulster. Accordingly, Colonel Seely, having every reason to believe that the Cabinet were in full agreement with

him as to the only possible policy to pursue in the crisis, and knowing that the policy could not be carried out unless the assurance already given to General Gough verbally was embodied in the memorandum, proceeded to do so by adding two additional paragraphs to the memorandum as follows :

‘ His Majesty’s Government must retain their right to use all the forces of the Crown in Ireland or elsewhere to maintain law and order, and to support the Civil Power in the ordinary execution of its duty.

‘ But they had no intention whatever of taking advantage of this right to crush political opposition to the policy or principles of the Home Rule Bill.’

These paragraphs were drafted in consultation with Lord Morley, but Colonel Seely does not seem to have taken the trouble to communicate them to Mr Asquith, who, if not in the Cabinet room, was at any rate only at lunch in an adjoining room ; or to Mr Churchill, who seems also to have stayed behind in 10 Downing Street, after the Cabinet had broken up. As a matter of fact the assurance, even so, was decidedly ambiguous, as Sir Edward Grey has, with extraordinary cynicism, pointed out since. It might, in fact, have been interpreted as meaning no more than that there was no intention of shooting Ulstermen for holding political meetings. This seems to have occurred to General Gough as well, and he asked Sir J. French whether the meaning of the document was that he could not be called upon to order his brigade to take part in coercing Ulster to submit to the Home Rule Bill. Sir J. French wrote across the note that in his opinion that was the case ; and with this, in his belief, explicit and assured guarantee General Gough returned to his command, while a sigh of relief went through the whole Army.

It would be idle to pretend that there was not on March 23 a crisis of the very first magnitude between the Government and the Army in which the Government gave way. Such a situation, however it arises, is a constitutional disaster. But the disaster was one entirely of the Government’s own creation. There was not and there never has been the slightest question about the loyalty and obedience of the Army. Still less has there

ever been any question of the Army wishing or attempting to interfere in politics. But that does not imply that an Army has no soul, no ordinary human and patriotic instincts, and that there is no limit to its obedience, however repulsive and outrageous the orders imposed upon it. In this case the Government proposed to use the Army to shoot down its fellow-citizens on behalf of a purely partisan policy. And over and above the outrage to the Army which this involved, the Government had contrived, by the wantonly provocative character of the contemplated campaign against Ulster, and by its blundering attempt at purging the Army by General Paget's interrogatory, to put itself in the wrong in every detail. To give way and recognise its mistake was, under the circumstances, the only possible course. But giving way involved the most serious indirect consequences for the Government. The assurance to General Gough was, in effect, an assurance to the whole Army, and implied that the coercion of Ulster was practically ruled out. But without coercion there could be no Home Rule Bill which the Nationalists would accept; and without the Nationalists the Government would fall.

The obvious policy under the circumstances was to smooth over all the facts as much as possible, give up the idea of coercion for the present, and wait for an occasion when Ulster might contrive to put itself sufficiently in the wrong to make the use of the Army possible again. The first thing was to conceal, as far as possible, all the traces of the great naval and military preparations which had been contemplated and initiated, and to make out that nothing beyond the 'modest and necessary operations' suggested by the War Office on March 14 had ever been taken in hand or contemplated. The second was to create the impression that there had not been and was not any real intention of proceeding to drastic measures against Ulster, and that the resignations at the Curragh had been due to a pure misunderstanding which the War Office had graciously cleared up. This was the line of defence adopted by Ministers in both Houses on Monday, March 23. So far as the first object is concerned, the effort at concealment was kept up consistently, though more and more of the facts have since then gradually been extorted by persistent questioning.

But the second object had to be abandoned almost from the outset. The truth as to what had really taken place at the War Office with regard to General Gough inevitably leaked out. On the Tuesday it was stated very explicitly in the House of Commons by Mr Amery, and evoked a frenzy of indignation among the Liberal and Labour rank and file. Mr John Ward, in a passionate speech of which the keynote was a declaration that Parliament should 'make the laws of the country absolutely without interference either from King or Army,' made himself the spokesman of a tide of feeling, partly due to genuine mortification and alarm, but inspired even more by the hope that in 'the People against the Army' might be found a cry to sweep the country and extricate the Party from its embarrassments.

On Wednesday morning the Government knew it could not survive the day if it admitted the truth as to what had taken place on Monday. It accordingly decided to repudiate the assurance given to General Gough on the plea that Colonel Seely had given it without the sanction of the Cabinet. The pledge was declared 'not operative'; and the intention to coerce Ulster by force was once more reasserted, and by no Minister more crudely and directly than by Sir E. Grey. The Coalition rank and file having thus been reassured, they were still further put into good heart by Mr Churchill, who openly associated himself with the mischievous cry of the 'People against the Army.' The other cry, that of the 'People against the King,' which, under the mistaken impression that the King had been responsible for the assurance given to General Gough, had met with such tempestuous enthusiasm from the Coalition, was, however, nipped in the bud by the Prime Minister.

The natural consequence of the repudiation of the assurance given by Colonel Seely would, of course, have been his resignation; and, in opening his statement, the War Minister clearly intimated that this had occurred. But the sympathy with which the House of Commons listened to his statement was turned to contempt when it leaked out at the close that the resignation was a mere formality, and that the Minister proposed to stay on and acquiesce in the dishonouring of his pledged word. By an amazing oversight Colonel Seely seems to have for-

gotten that the assurance had been signed, not only by himself, but by Sir J. French and Sir J. S. Ewart, and that they might take a very different view as to what their honour demanded under the circumstances. This was discovered next morning; and, in spite of the most desperate and persistent efforts to find some formula which would induce them to stay—including the announcement to the House of Commons on the Friday of a perfectly meaningless new Army Order, and the delivering by the Prime Minister of certain sentences which it was hoped would imply 'no coercion of Ulster' to the soldiers while implying coercion to the House—the two generals persisted in resigning. It was the only thing they could do. But it obviously made Colonel Seely's position impossible. On Monday, March 30, he resigned; and the Prime Minister announced that he meant to act as Minister of War himself. The dramatic manner of the announcement raised, in the Government ranks, an enthusiasm for which neither the circumstances nor Mr Asquith's own drifting temperament afford much justification. So far as General Gough and, indeed, the Army at large are concerned, the definite assurance given by the Army Council still holds good, all Parliamentary repudiations notwithstanding; and the attempt to assert the policy of armed coercion in practice will inevitably renew a crisis which Mr Asquith will be no more able to cope with than was Colonel Seely.

Not the least deplorable feature of the whole crisis has been the entire abandonment by Ministers of that traditional straightforwardness in dealing with Parliament which is so essential to the successful working of the constitutional machine. Not even over the Marconi affair was Parliament the victim of such an orgy of sheer prevarication. From the Prime Minister downwards all the Ministers declared at the outset that absolutely no orders of any kind had been given to General Paget beyond the instructions contained in the War Office letter of March 14. The facts themselves disproved this contention, which was finally belied when Sir A. Paget's answer to those instructions—suppressed in the White Paper which professed to publish all the relevant correspondence—slipped out in answer to a written question. Again and again the Prime Minister

stated that there had been no naval movements whatever, on the last occasion after the actual facts had been admitted by Mr Churchill an hour before. The whole story with regard to Colonel Seely's addition of the two 'peccant paragraphs,' as told in the House of Commons, teemed with inherent impossibilities.

More amazing still, while Colonel Seely made no reference whatever in his statement to Lord Morley's collaboration in 'the peccant paragraphs,' and Mr Asquith immediately afterwards stated, in answer to Mr Balfour, that no colleague of the War Minister's had ever seen those paragraphs, it subsequently became known that Lord Morley had actually read out the reference to that collaboration from the written text of Colonel Seely's statement. Is it credible that Colonel Seely never submitted his statement to Mr Asquith, or at least informed him of Lord Morley's share in the business? If he did either, then Mr Asquith must have been guilty of a direct misstatement of fact. And if the direct 'yes' and 'no' of Ministers cannot be trusted, all political discussion becomes impossible. Disingenuousness of statement was matched by equal disingenuousness in action. Lord Morley's refusal to follow Colonel Seely's resignation and his shuffling defence of that refusal, Lord Haldane's 'cooking' of the record of his speech against coercion so as entirely to reverse its meaning, and, above all, the flat repudiation of the assurance on the strength of which General Gough accepted reinstatement, are things of which no real explanation has been offered.

On March 31, the debate on the Second Reading (for the third time) of the Home Rule Bill began, and continued till April 6, in the absence of the Prime Minister, who was conducting his uncontested election in East Fife. For a moment it seemed as if the Government might be prepared to make some advance towards meeting the Opposition on the main issue of submitting the Home Rule Bill to the verdict of the electorate. Sir E. Grey suggested that, while the Bill itself must go on the Statute Book first, it might be under some arrangement which might be perfectly fair as between both parties, whichever won the subsequent election, and that there could be no coercion of Ulster before such an election. The obvious inference was that he contemplated the inclusion

in the Bill of some proviso whereby it would lapse automatically unless confirmed by a resolution of the House of Commons after the election. This would mean saving face as regards the Home Rule Bill, and still passing Welsh Disestablishment and Plural Voting under the Parliament Act. But the power behind the throne evidently scouted the idea; and on the next day Sir E. Grey had to undergo the humiliation of being present at his public repudiation by Mr Samuel. Once more the Government attitude stiffened. An offer by the Unionist leaders to insure that no obstacles should be placed in the way of the immediate passage of the Bill, if confirmed at a General Election, elicited no response; and the passage of the Second Reading by a majority of 80 has left the deadlock more complete than ever.

It is true that on both sides during this debate members on the back benches freely discussed the desirability of a settlement by consent based on the adoption of some sort of federal or devolutionary system for the whole United Kingdom. Even Sir E. Grey toyed with the idea that, if Ulster accepted the Government proposal, the six years might be devoted to exploring the federal question—presumably with the same determination to achieve a positive result as has been shown in regard to the question of Second Chamber reform since the passing of the Parliament Act. Mr Redmond, however, threw a most effectual douche of cold water on all the federalist talk, by explaining that he had no objection to federalism, so long as it did not involve the possibility of Ulster forming a separate federal unit, or so long as none of the powers granted to Ireland under the Home Rule Bill were whittled down—in other words, so long as it did not interfere with separatism. His utterance was illuminating, for it made it palpable beyond dispute that the idea of a settlement by consent on federal or quasi-federal lines is out of the question so long as he can exercise a controlling influence—that is to say, so long as the present Government exists.

That, indeed, is the crux of the whole situation. There is probably a substantial majority in the House of Commons to-day who would agree readily to the setting up of a non-party convention to discuss and settle the whole question of the constitution of the

United Kingdom and the working of Parliament—the only method by which a true settlement by consent can be attained. But those who share this view on the Liberal side are in a position of great difficulty. They cannot push the policy of conciliation to its conclusion without destroying the Government. And the destruction of the Government, in their belief, will involve the loss not only of the pending measures of its programme, but of all that the Liberal Party has secured since 1910. The idea of a return to the political conditions of 1909, or the creation of a Second Chamber reformed on Tory lines and made stronger in the process, and the prospect of a generation of renewed effort to alter the situation so created, or even to abolish Plural Voting, are to them intolerable. If the desperate cohesion of the Liberal ranks, even in the face of civil war, is to be broken up, that fear must be clearly and definitely dispelled.

The Unionist Party has already given ample guarantees to its opponents in the event of an election being decided in favour of the present Government. It has given no guarantees in the event of a Unionist victory. And yet to give such guarantees would be the part not only of sound tactics for the present, but of true wisdom for the future. Whatever the majority by which a Unionist Government may be returned, it will be crushed and rendered utterly sterile for all fresh constructive effort, if it has to attempt the superhuman task of dealing with the Irish problem and the Parliamentary problem on party lines. That those problems can only be dealt with successfully as a single whole and on national lines will be as true then as it is to-day. If the Unionist leaders gave a guarantee to-morrow of their intention, if returned at an election, immediately to refer the whole constitutional and Parliamentary problem to a free and equal national convention, they would not be tying their hands for the future, they would only be announcing the inevitable conclusion of a far-sighted view of the problem. But they would at the same time have undermined the whole moral fabric upon which the Coalition now rests, and have done the one thing within their power and consistent with their honour to avert the appalling catastrophe of civil war.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH VOLUME OF THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

- Aeroplanes for military purposes, 559.
- Africa. South, self-governing colonies of, growth of population, 539.
- Aircraft in War, 558—the term 'aerial supremacy,' *ib.*—the air service of France, 558, 560—airships, aeroplanes and kites for military purposes, 559—the German organisation, 560—British, 561—the Military Wing, 561, 562—564—the Naval Wing, 561, 562—utility in reconnaissance, 564—567—suitable landing-grounds, 566—action of aircraft against aircraft in the air, 567—against troops on the ground, 568.
- Airships for military purposes, 559.
- Alcohol, use of, for motor fuel, 184.
- America, War of Independence, 110.
- Asquith, Rt Hon. H. H., M.P., his views on the Home Rule Bill, 274, 277, 278—his dilatory tactics on the Home Rule crisis, 571—proposal of a referendum to be held in Ulster, 573.
- Atlantic Cable, proposed, 138—cost of the line, 139.
- Australasia, self-governing colonies of, growth of population, 539.

B.

- Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J., M.P., 'Nationality and Home Rule,' 267.
- Barklie, John, 'The Title Tangle in Southern Rhodesia,' 254.
- Beaumont and Fletcher, The Plays of, 25—their friendship, 26—publication of their plays, 27—corruption of the age, 28—character of their plays, 30—44—plots, 32—'The Coxcomb,' and other plays, 36—44—their services to drama, 41—Influence of Jonson, *ib.*—collaboration with Massinger, 43—their genius for lyric, 44.
- Benoist-Hanappier, L., 'Le Drame Naturaliste en Allemagne,' 95.
- Berry, Dr Henry F., 'Early Statutes,' edited by, 420, 422.
- Bosanquet, Bernard, 'The Philosophy of Eucken,' 365.
- Bradley, F. H., 'Ethical Studies,' extract from, 375—his Preface to 'Appearance and Reality,' 378.
- Brailsford, H. N., 'The Broom of the War God,' 486—'Macedonia,' 487.
- Bright, Charles, 'Inter-imperial Telegraphy,' 134.
- British Foreign Policy in the Last Century, 291. See Clarendon and Lyons.

- British South Africa Company, grant of a charter, 536. *See* Rhodesia.
- Broke, Lord Willoughby de, his Introduction to 'National Revival,' 196.
- Brougham, Lord, on the achievements of Lazare Carnot, 345.
- Bucer, Martin, and the Reformation**, 116—his birth, 117—joins the Dominican Order at Schlettstadt, *ib.*—his relations with Luther, 118—freed from his monastic vows, *ib.*—marriage, *ib.*—at Strassburg, 119—his lectures, 120—friendship with Jacob Sturm, 121—influence of his controversial writings, *ib.*—power of organisation, 122—establishment of schools, *ib.*—arbitrator and adviser, 123—drafts ecclesiastical ordinances, *ib.*—his views on the disputes between Luther and Zwingli, 124—128—received by the Archbishop of Canterbury, 129—his criticisms on the state of religion in England, 129—131—appointed to the chair of the theology at Cambridge, 131—'De Regno Christi,' *ib.*—his death, *ib.*—compiles the 'Consultation' or plan of reformation, 132—his treatise 'De re vestiaria in sacris,' and 'Censura,' *ib.*—influence on the English Reformation, 133.
- Bulgaria, relations with Greece, 487, 498—number in Macedonia, 488—campaign against Turkey, 493—begins the second war, 497—aggressions, 498.
- Bulgarians, character of their rule in Macedonia, 507—treatment of the Greek women, 507 *note*—retreat from Kilikis, 509—alleged atrocities, 511–516—barbarities and massacres by the Greeks, 511–523.
- Bullen, A. H., 'The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher,' edited by, 28.
- Bulthaupt, Heinrich, 'Dramaturgie des Schauspiels,' 94.
- Burghclere, Lady, 'The Life of James, First Duke of Ormonde,' 434.
- Burns, Robert, his admiration of Gray's 'Elegy,' 396.
- Burrows, Ronald M., 'The New Greece,' 483.
- Burton, Robert, 'History of the Principality of Wales,' 357.
- Butler, Samuel, 152. *See* 'Erewhon.'
- Butterfield, Mr, his estimate on the yield of oil shale, 181.
- C.
- Cables, British, under foreign control, 136—compared with wireless, 146–151.
- Callendar, Prof. H. L., his address to the British Association at Dundee, 339, 347.
- Canada, views on the proposed Imperial Naturalisation Bill, 15, 21–24.
- Carill, James, 'The Carnot Family,' 339.
- Carnegie Commission, evidence on the Greek atrocities in Macedonia, 506, 515, 522.
- Carnot Family, The**, 339—at Nolay, *ib.*—Claude and Margaret, their sons and daughters, 340—the appearance and military exploits of Feulint, 342—career of Lazare, 343—his conduct at the battle of Wattignies, *ib.*—work as Organisateur de la Victoire, 344—absence of ambition, *ib.*—mathematical writings, 345—scientific mind, *ib.*—his paper on dirigible balloons, 346—organisation of primary education, *ib.*—career of his son Sadi, 347—his 'Reflexions sur la Puissance Motrice du Feu,' *ib.*—career of Hippolyte, 349—Marie François Sadi, *ib.*—appointed Finance Minister, *ib.*—elected President, 350—murdered, *ib.*—researches of Adolphe, 351—his sons, *ib.*
- Case, Prof. R. H., 'The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher,' 25.
- Cecil, Algernon, 'Some Reflections on Patriotism,' 194.
- Cecil, Lord Hugh, 'Conservatism,' 203, 208.
- Chamberlain, Rt Hon. A., M.P., on federal government for the United Kingdom, 276.
- Chopin, his friendship with George Sand, 322, 330—defection, 334.

Christians and Pagans, contrast between, 60, 61.

Churchill, Rt Hon. W., M.P., his views on the Home Rule Bill, 273—character of his speech at Bradford, 575.

Clarendon, George Villiers, Fourth Earl of, succeeds to the title, 296—his marriage, 298—joins the Melbourne Ministry, 299—views on Free Trade, 300—Viceroy of Ireland, *ib.*—appointed Foreign Secretary, 301-303, 305—his criticisms on Lord Palmerston, 304—political views, *ib.*—characteristics of his letters, 305, 306.

Colvin Ian D., 'The Future of Rhodesia: For the Charter,' 524.

Conservatism, character of its principles, 210—danger of immoderate language, 215—greatness of heart, the true spirit, 218.

Cordellier, John, 'The Spiral Way,' 222, 243.

Cowper, W., his letter to J. Hill on the poems of Gray, 395.

D.

Darwin, Charles, 'The Origin of Species,' 166—his relations with S. Butler, 167.

Darwin, Sir Francis, extract from his presidential address to the British Association in 1908, 169.

Dawson, Richard, 'The Progress of Rhodesia,' 247.

Deissmann, A., 'St Paul,' 47.

Dowson, M. E., 236. *See* Palmer.

Dragoumis, Ion or Idas, 'The Blood of Martyrs and Heroes,' 489—'Samothráke,' 502.

Dunlop, Robert, 'The English in Ireland,' 414.

E.

England, the currency policy, 468—use of cheques and notes, 481

England, the Reformation, 129—state of religion, 130—influence of Martin Bucer, 133.

'Erewhon,' The Author of, 152—a humorous philosopher, 153, 161—list of his 'finds,' 154—his birth and education, 155—work among the poor, *ib.*—sheep-farming in New Zealand, 156—returns to London and studies painting, *ib.*—'Erewhon,' 157—'The Fair Haven,' *ib.*—'Life and Habit,' 157, 168, 170—his views on the importance of money, 157—a Hedonist, 159—on the meaning of 'grace,' *ib.*—his views on religion, 160—belief in compromise, 161—'Evolution Old and New,' and other literary works, 162-165, 168—translation of the 'Odyssey' and the 'Iliad,' 162—'The Sonnets of Shakespeare,' 163—his view of the relative importance of the two lives, 164—views on the work of Darwin, 165-168—'Luck or Cunning?' 168—scientific views, 168-171—views on Identity, 170—'The Way of All Flesh,' 171, 172.

Eucken, The Philosophy of, I, 365—his 'New Idealism,' *ib.*—his activism, 366, 388—use of the words 'new' and 'breach,' 367—character of the New Idealism, 368—progressist and ethical, *ib.*—humanistic, 369—meaning of the words Personalism and Individualism, *ib.*—the self-existent spiritual world, 370—his 'life-systems' or 'syntagmas,' 371—watchwords, Form, *ib.*—Process, Naturalism and Intellectualism, 372—'Neological,' *ib.*—relation of the eternal order to the progressive world, 373—whether evil is or can be overcome, 374—how the moral attitude can be reconciled with religion, *ib.*—his wide influence, 376—tone of his moralisings, *ib.*—his vice of Intellectualism, 377—his Syntagma theories not life-systems, *ib.*—opinion on his activism, 378—II, Criticisms on his philosophy, 379—subordination of the concept to the life-process, 380—vitalistic element, 381-383—personalistic or activistic element, 383—truth for constructive philosophy, the conceptual flower of Reality, 384-387—influence of Religion, 387—his treatise 'Die Einheit des Geisteslebens,' 388.

F.

Fairless, Michael, 'The Road-mender,' 236—character of her mysticism, 236, 240.

FitzGerald, Edward, on the merit of the 'Elegy,' 393.

Fletcher, John, his plays, 25. *See* Beaumont.

France, the currency policy, 468—Bank of France, system of issuing notes, 481—the Air Service, 558, 560.

Friedmann, Sigismund, 'Das deutsche Drama,' 94.

G.

George V, King, loss of his prerogative, 195.

German Drama, The Contemporary, 69—production of 'Die Karolinger,' 70—the anthology 'Moderne Dichtercharakteren,' 71—influence of Ibsen, 71, 80—the 'Free Stage' of Berlin, 72—G. Hauptmann's 'Vor Sonnenaufgang,' 73—'Das Friedensfest,' *ib.*—'Einsame Menschen,' and 'Die Weber,' 74—Sudermann's 'Ehre,' *ib.*—character of the drama, 75—power of environment, 76—the naturalistic drama, 77—'Hannele,' *ib.*—craving for a neo-idealism, 79—influence of Nietzsche, 80—'Die Versunkene Glocke,' 82—'Der Schleier der Beatrice,' 83—'Monna Vanna,' 84—'Electra,' 85—religious drama, *ib.*—the rise of G. d'Annunzio, 86—'Salome,' *ib.*—G. B. Shaw, 87—Max Halbe and other dramatists, 88—90—the drama of *Sehnsuchtmensch*, 91—characteristics of Wildenbruch, 92—Sudermann, *ib.*—Hauptmann, 93—views of critics, 94.

Germany, the currency policy, 468, 481—organisation of the Air Service, 560.

Gibson, W. R. Boyce, 'The Philosophy of Eucken,' 379.

Gilbert, Sir J. S., 'History of the Irish Confederation,' 102.

Gold currency for India, 466 *et seq.*

Goschen, Lord, on the substitution of small notes for gold, 468.

Gosse, Edmund, 'The Works of Thomas Gray,' edited by, 398.

Gough, General, his refusal to serve against Ulster, 580—reinstatement, 583.

Gray, Thomas, The Letters of, 390—character of his poems, 392—the 'Elegy,' 393—'The Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College,' *ib.*—Hymn to Adversity, 394—the personal element, *ib.*—opinion of Cowper and Burns, 395—Johnson, 396—his characteristics, 397, 405—publication of his letters, 398—discovery of his letters to Walpole 399—satirical sketch of Cambridge, 400, 406—at Burnham, 402—his travels, 403—letter to Ashton, 404—to West, *ib.*—his fastidiousness and refinement, 405—visits to the country, 407—limited means, *ib.*—relations with the undergraduates, 408—horror of fire, *ib.*—'Progress of Poesy,' 409—scholarship, *ib.*—wide reading and culture, 410—critical gift, *ib.*—terror of his life, 411—413—appointed Professor at Cambridge, 412.

Greece, The New, 483—first revival, *ib.*—second revival, 484—a refining and civilising force, *ib.*—defects of the Greeks, *ib.*—population, 485, 501—problem of the 'unredeemed,' 485—result of the war with Turkey, 486—H. N. Brailsford's 'The Broom of the War God,' *ib.*—the Macedonian question, 487—number of Greeks in Bulgaria, 488—'memento from Macedonia,' 489—Ion Dragoumis' 'The Blood of Martyrs and Heroes,' *ib.*—formation of the Military League, 490—character of E. Venizélos' leadership, *ib.*—his initiation of the Balkan League, 491—organisation and discipline of the army, 492, 501—capture of the fortress of Janina, 492—command of the sea, 493—difficulty of dividing the spoil, *ib.*—election arrangements, 494—Venizélos' lofty conception of patriotism, 495—497—character of Bulgarian statesmanship, 497—accusations against, 498—the affair of Akandjali, 499—territory, 501—development of the new provinces, *ib.*—motto, 502—value of the literary movement, *ib.*—lament over Dimitri Livanás, 502—505.

Greeks, their devastation of Macedonia, 508, 523—accusations against, 509—evidence of refugees, 510, 517—barbarities and massacres, 511—523—'Intercepted Letters,' 511, *note*—accusations against the Bulgarians, 511—516—systematic plan, 521.

Grey, Lord, his views on Federalism and Nationalism, 288.

Guiney, Louise Imogen, 'Milton and Vaughan,' 353.

H.

Haggard, A. M., 'Michael Fairless, Her Life and Writings,' 236.

Halbe, Max, 'Der Eroberer,' 84—'Jugend,' 88.

Hanstein, Adalbert von, 'Das Jüngste Deutschland,' 95.

Harnack, Adolf, 'The Expansion of Christianity,' 62.

Harrison, F. C., 'Indian Finance and Currency,' 465.

Hauptmann, Gerhart, 'Vor Sonnen-aufgang,' 73—'Das Friedensfest,' *ib.*—'Die Weber,' 74—'Hannele,' 77—'Führmann Henschel,' 78—'Die Versunkene Glocke,' 82—'Und Pippa tanzt,' *ib.*—character of his writing, 93.

Hegel, F. von, his influence on the philosophy of Eucken, 381.

Henry II, King, lands at Waterford, 417—his progress through Ireland, *ib.*—method of government, 418.

Heywood, Thomas, 'The Life of Merlin,' 357.

Hobhouse, L. T., 'Liberalism,' 203.

Home Rule Crisis and a National Settlement, 266—character of the real issue, 267—the Irish claim to separate national existence, a fictitious claim, *ib.*—result of the Parliament Act, 268—resistance of Ulster, justified, 269—the Unionist party pledged to support Ulster, 270—result of civil war, *ib.*—views of Lord Loreburn, 272, and other members of Parliament, 273—278—

F. S. Oliver's pamphlet on 'The Alternatives to Civil War,' 279—result of the proposed exclusion of Ulster, 280—283—conditions of a settlement, 283—285, 290—appointment of a Convention, 283—objection to a 'standardised' Home Rule, 285—recognition of the right of Irishmen to frame their constitution, 286—federalism compared with nationalism, 288—work of the Convention, 289.

Home Rule Crisis, The, 570—extract from the King's Speech, 571—dilatatory tactics of Mr Asquith, 572—declaration against, *ib.*—demonstration of April 4th, 573—proposal of a referendum to be held in Ulster, *ib.*—the six years' limit, 574—rejection of the proposal, 575—uncompromising speech of Mr Churchill at Bradford, *ib.*—military measures against Ulster, 576—579—Instructions to General Paget, 580—conditions to the officers, *ib.*—their refusal to operate against Ulster, 581—character of the British Army, 581, 584—capitulation of the Government, 582—reinstatement of General Gough, 583—Colonel Seely at the Cabinet Council, *ib.*—his additional paragraphs to the memorandum, 584—policy adopted by the Ministers, 585—repudiation of the assurance given by Colonel Seely, 586—resignation of the two generals and Col. Seely, 587—prevarication of Ministers, *ib.*—debate on the second reading of the Home Rule Bill, 588—Sir E. Grey's proposal, *ib.*—result of the policy of conciliation, 590.

Hone, Percy F., 'Southern Rhodesia,' 253.

Hozier, Col. Sir Henry, secretary to Lloyd's, 458.

I.

Ibsen, H., his influence on the German drama, 71, 80.

Inchcape, Lord, director of the National Provincial Bank of England, 476—his letter to Sir E. Holden, *ib.*

Indian Finance and Currency, 465—appointment of a Royal Commission, *ib.*—conclusions, 466—question of a gold currency, *ib.*—advantages of using gold, 467—a support to exchange, 468—need for sufficient, 469, 482—liquidation of an adverse balance, 469—use of silver rupees instead of gold, 470—merits of the present system, 471—the use of a paper currency in Nicaragua, *ib.*—system in Java, 472—estimate of the rupee and note circulation, 473—difference between gold and gold securities, 474—custody of cash balances, 475—list of available banks, 476—proposed establishment of a Central Bank, 477, 480—Presidency, Exchange and Local Banks, 478—conflict of interest between the Government and the Banks in regard to the internal exchanges, 479—various proposed changes, 480—the note system, 481.

Inge, Rev. W. R., Dean of St Paul's, 'St Paul,' 45.

Insurance and Lloyd's, 441. See Lloyd's.

Ireland, The English in, 414—history of the first English colony, 415—invasion by Robert Fitzstephen, 416—Henry II lands at Waterford, 417—appoints Hugh de Lacy his viceroy, 418—progress of the colony, *ib.*—treatment of the Irish by the invaders in the reign of John, 419—political, legal, and social rights, *ib.*—period of consolidation and internal development, 420—works on, 420, 425, 430—constitutional government, 421—the fundamental law of the connexion, 422—social incidents, 423—the Marches, 424—causes for the process of decay, 424–426—the Statute of Kilkenny, 426—relations between the Irish and the colonists, 427—legislative measures, 428—ascendancy of the House of Kildare, 428–430—result of the downfall, 430, 432—'consolidation of the clans,' 430—attempts to force the Reformation, 431—dangers of a bureaucratic system of government, *ib.*—relations between the gentry of the Pale and the English official class, 432—policy of Charles I, 433—outbreak of the Rebellion, 433, 435—the Cromwellian Settlement, 434–437—disadvantages of James,

Duke of Ormond, 434—policy of Charles II, 436–438—James II, 438—repeal of the Act of Settlement, 439.

Ireland, fictitious claim to separate national existence, 267.

J.

James, Henry, 'George Sand,' 315.

Jameson, Sir Starr, his views on responsible government for Rhodesia, 249—on the result of concessions, 251.

Java, gold exchange system, 472.

Jebb, Richard, 'The Imperial Naturalisation Bill,' 1—'The Britannic Question,' 214.

Jewish religion, historical and teleological character, 54.

Johnson, Dr, on the value of letters, 390—his opinion of the poems of Gray, 396.

Johnston, Leslie, 'Modern Mysticism: Some Prophets and Poets,' 220.

Jonson, Ben, his influence on the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, 41.

K.

Karénine, Mme Vladimir, 'George Sand, sa Vie et ses Œuvres,' 315, 322.

Keith, A. B., 'Responsible Government in the Dominions,' 2 *note*.

Kites, for military purposes, 559.

Klopp, Onno, 'Der Fall des Hauses Stuart im Zusammenhange der europäischen Angelegenheiten, 1660–1714,' 438.

L.

Lansdowne, Lord, on the Home Rule Bill, 276.

Law, Rt Hon. Bonar, M.P., on the Home Rule Bill, 275.

- Lewes, Prof. Vivian B., 'Oil Fuel,' 179.
- Liberalism, character of its principles, 199—partisanship, 199-201.
- Lindsay, *Principal Thomas M.*, 'Martin Bucer,' 116.
- Litzmann, Berthold, 'Das deutsche Drama,' 94.
- Lloyd's and Insurance**, 441—growing habit of insurance, *ib.*—history of Lloyd's, 442—collection and dissemination of news, *ib.*—the reports, 443—use of stations, *ib.*—signal-stations, 444—function of the agents, 445—work of the London Salvage Association, *ib.*—case of the 'Oceana,' 446—importance of accurate news, *ib.*—cases of mistakes, 447—the Captain's Register, 448—trade movements, *ib.*—Register of British and Foreign Shipping, 449—construction of vessels, *ib.*—members of the Committee, 450—the Royal Exchange, *ib.*—the Lutine Bell, 451—the Casualty Book, *ib.*—business of the brokers, 452—the underwriters, 453—tendency towards co-ordination, 454—rigorous code of honour, 455—different types of ships and various risks, 455-457—committee of management, 457—election of chairmen, *ib.*—funds of the underwriting members, 458—extension of non-marine business, 459—war insurance, 460—strikes, 461-463—holiday rain scheme, 463—aviation and race-horses, *ib.*—coronation day, 464—General Election, *ib.*
- London Salvage Association, work of the, 445.
- Longden, J. H., 'The Future of Rhodesia: Against the Charter,' 536.
- Loreburn, Lord, his views on the Home Rule Bill, 272.
- Lothar, Rudolph, 'Das deutsche Drama der Gegenwart,' 95.
- St Luke, his characteristics, 48.
- Luscombe, Sir John, elected chairman of Lloyd's, 457, 458.
- Luther, Martin, his 'Ninety-five Theses,' 118—disputes with Zwingli, 124.
- Lutine Bell, in the Royal Exchange office, 451.
- Lyons, Lord, his character as an ambassador, 306—at Washington, 307—Paris, 307-312—on the relations between France and England, 311—resigns his post, 312—death, *ib.*
- M.
- Macaulay, Lord, his views on Milton, 357.
- MacCarthy, *Desmond*, 'The Author of "Erewhon,"' 152.
- Macdonald, J. Ramsay, 'The Socialist Movement,' 203.
- Macedonia, The Devastation of**, 506—character of the Bulgarian rule, 507—population, *ib.*—severity of the devastation, 508, 523—number and condition of the refugees, 509, 517—accusations against the Greeks, 509—depositions of the refugees, 510, 517—barbarity of the Greeks, 511-523—alleged atrocities of the Bulgarians, 511—the 'Intercepted Greek Letters,' 511 *note*, 521—case of Doxato, 513—Serres, 514—sack of Bulgarkeni, 518—systematic plan of the Greeks, 521.
- Macedonian question, 487—yield of tobacco, 501.
- Mackay, Sir James, 476. *See* Inchcape.
- Mahaffy, Prof., his Introduction to 'Revolutionary Ireland,' 415 *note*.
- Mason, W., 'The Poems of Mr Gray, to which are prefixed Memoirs of his Life and Writings,' 398.
- Massinger, his collaboration with Fletcher, 43—'The Roman Actor,' 44.
- Masson, Prof., on the life of Milton, 358, 360—on his religious views, 362.
- Maughan, *Cuthbert*, 'Lloyd's and Insurance,' 441.
- Maxwell, Rt Hon. Sir H., 'The Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of Clarendon,' 306, 314.

McKechnie, Dr W. S., 'The New Democracy and the Constitution,' 201.

Mentz, F., und Alf. Erichson, 'Bibliographische Zusammenstellung der gedruckten Schriften Butzer's,' 116.

Miletitch, Dr L., 'Atrocités Grecques en Macédoine,' 515.

Military motor vehicles, War Department subsidy scheme, 188-192.

Mills, James, 'Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls,' edited by, 420.

Milner, Lord, 'The Nation and the Empire,' 197, 211, 212, 214, 216.

Milton and Vaughan, 353—Milton's influence on the poems of Vaughan, 355—character of his prose pamphlets, *ib.*—political views, 357—'Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,' 358—blindness, *ib.*—pamphlet, 'Church Government,' 360—religious views, 362—idealism, 364.

Moryson, Fynes, extract from his 'Itinerary,' 97.

Moseley, H., his publication of Milton's book of verse, 355.

Motor Transport: A National Question, 178—demand and supply of petrol, 179—employment of alternative fuels, 180—yield of oil shale, 181—coke-oven gas, 182—'stripping' spirit from coal gas, bituminous and cannel coals, *ib.*—increasing use of motors, 183—use of alcohol as a fuel, 184—work of the committee of the Imperial Motor Transport Council, 185—cost of operating motor vehicles, 186—improvement of roads, *ib.*—essential features in the vehicles, 187—type of independent tractor, *ib.*—free provision of expert information and advice, 188—military motor vehicles, 188-192—War Department subsidy scheme, 189-192—agricultural motors, 192.

Murray, R. H., 'The Evolution of the Ulsterman,' 96—'Revolutionary Ireland and its Settlement,' 106.

Murray, Dr Robert H., 'Revolutionary Ireland,' 415 *note*, 438.

Mysticism, Modern: Some Prophets and Poets, 220—works on,

222—definition of mysticism, 223-225—three stages of the 'Mystic Way,' 225—the works of Francis Thompson, 227-232—R. Tagore, 232-236—M. Fairless, 236—tendency of an 'immanent' type of religious experience, 237—their love for children, 238—appreciation of nature, 239—character of their faith, 240—view of God, 241—esoteric attitude of mystics, 242—of Miss Underhill, 243—J. Cordelier, 244—common attitude to reality, 245.

N.

'National Revival,' 197, 202, 209.

National Settlement and the Home Rule Crisis, 266. *See* Home.

Naturalisation Bill, The Imperial, 1—meaning of the term, 2—anomaly to be rectified, 2, 11—rights or privileges of a British subject, 3—responsibilities or liabilities, *ib.*—political rights, 4—use of the term 'citizen,' 5—report on the interpretation and administration of the naturalisation laws, *ib.*—case of 'double nationality,' 6—principles of Common Law, *ib.*—Statute Law, 7—admission of foreigners to British subjecthood, *ib.*—Act of 1844, 8—of 1870, *ib.*—disqualifications of aliens, 9—status of wives and children, 10—proposed remedial measures, 12, 15—question of constitutional principle, 13—character of the colonial laws, 14—Aliens Act of 1905, 15—misapprehension of the question, 17—character of the Bill, 18-21—objections of the British Government, 19—twofold purpose, 21—attitude of Canada, 21-24.

'New-Idealism,' philosophy of, 365—characteristics, 368.

Newman, Cardinal, on the value of letters, 390.

Newton, Lord, 'Lord Lyons: a Record of British Diplomacy,' 307, 314.

Nicaragua, system of paper currency, 471.

Nicholson, Prof., criticism of his article on 'The Vagaries of Recent Political Economy,' 174-176—note by, 176.

Nietzsche, F., his influence on the drama, 80, 83.

Nordau, Max, 'Degeneration,' extract from, 223.

Northup, Prof. C. S., Introduction and Notes to 'Essays and Criticisms by Thomas Gray,' 399, 409.

O.

O'Leary, Dr, his account of the sack of Bulgarkeui, 518-520.

Oliver, F. S., 'The Alternatives to Civil War,' 279.

Ormond, James, First Duke of, Life of, viceroy of Ireland, 434—effect on his career of his religious views, *ib.*—his policy, 435—Act of Settlement, 436—removed from office, 437—reappointed viceroy, 438.

Orpen, Goddard Henry, 'Ireland under the Normans,' 416.

P.

Pagans and Christians, contrast between, 60, 61.

Paget, General Sir A., his measures against Ulster, 577—instructions from the Government, 578, 580, 587.

Palmer, William Scott (M. E. Dowson), 'Michael Fairless, Her Life and Writings,' 236.

Parliament Act, result of the, 268.

Patriotism, Some Reflections on, 194—the spirit of the old constitution, 195—decline of the monarchy, *ib.*—works on, 196-198, 203—Lord Milner's 'The Nation and the Empire,' 197, 210-212, 214—'A National Revival,' 197, 202—definition of the term 'patriotism,' 199—want of patriotism in modern Liberalism, 199-201—danger of democracy, 201—the will of the people, the wrong standard, 202—R. Macdonald's 'Socialist Movement,' 203—views on the character of Socialism, 204-208—Lord H.

Cecil's 'Conservatism,' 208-210, 212—character of Conservatism, 210, 215—function of the House of Lords, 213—development of the Imperial idea, *ib.*—administration of foreign affairs, 215—dangers of immoderate language, *ib.*—criticisms on the leaders, 216—evils of candidature, 217—the true Conservative spirit, 218.

St Paul, 45—his personal characteristics, 45, 53—criticisms on, 46—authenticity of the Epistles, 47—place of his birth, 49—a 'tent-maker,' 50—his appearance, *ib.*—education, 51—physical trouble, *ib.*—privations and sufferings, 52—temptations, 53—influence of the Pharisaic teaching, 54-56—dissatisfaction with the stoning of Stephen, 57—becomes a Christian, 58—character of his preaching, 59-61—his eloquence and sincerity, 60—contrast between Christian and Pagan society, *ib.*—his missionary journeys, 61—in Rome, *ib.*—rejection of Christianity by the Jews, 62—development of his teaching, 63, 64—characteristics of the Christian communities, 65—his use of the word 'mystery,' 66—transitional teaching, 67.

Perry, Prof., 'Present Philosophical Tendencies,' extract from, 380.

Petrol, demand and supply of, 178—alternative fuels, 180.

Pigou, Prof. A. C., his criticism of Prof. Nicholson's article on 'The Vagaries of Recent Political Economy,' 174-176.

Poincaré, M., his oration over the monument to President Carnot, 339, 350.

Political Economy, The Vagaries of Recent: A Reply and Rejoinder, 174-177.

Poncey, Charles, letter from George Sand, 336.

Puaux, René, on the alleged Bulgarian atrocities, 516.

R.

Ramsay, Sir W. M., 'St Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen,' 47.

Redwood, Sir Boverton, 'Petroleum and its Products,' 179.

Reformation, The, and Martin Bucer, 116. *See* Bucer.

Rhodes, Cecil, his administration of Rhodesia, 524—views on a self-governing State, 529—on the work of the Chartered Company, 535.

Rhodesia, The Future of: I. **For the Charter**, 524—specific criticisms of the Company, 525—alienation of land, 525-527—mining policy, 527—railways, *ib.*—'commercial taint,' 528—question of self-government for Southern Rhodesia, 528-530, 551—cost of administration and defence, 530-532—alternative of inclusion in the Union, 532-534, 553—renewal of the Charter, 534—justification of the Company rule, *ib.*—record of its work, 535. II. **Against the Charter**, 536—double character of the Company, *ib.*—development of Southern Rhodesia, 538, 540—compared with Bechuanaland, *ib.*—tables showing the growth of population in the self-governing colonies of Australasia and South Africa, 539—population, 540—baneful commercial influence, *ib.*—opposition between the Company and the settlers, 541—Goldie Scheme, *ib.*—the pro-Charter party, 542—the mining industry, *ib.*—the anti-Charter party, 543-546—the farming industry, 544—Agricultural Union, 544, 547—patriotisms of the Rhodesian, 545—of the home-born, *ib.*—Conference in the Goldie Scheme at Salisbury, 546—Labour Tax Ordinance and the Rhodesian League, 547—dissatisfaction against the Company, *ib.*—additional representation in the Legislative Council, 548—Land Settlement Scheme, 549—the forthcoming elections, 550—form of responsible government, 551—representative government, 552—case for Union, 553—objections to the inclusion, 553, 556—advantages, 554—railway question, *ib.*—management of the natives, 555—Asiatic question, *ib.*

Rhodesia, The Progress of, 247—area, population and climate, *ib.*—grievances of settlers, 248, 261—demand for responsible government, 249—period of agricultural and industrial development, 250—policy of the Chartered Company,

250 *et seq.*—result of concessions, 251—promotion of settlement, 252—sale of land, *ib.*—system of land taxation, 253—controversy as to the ownership of land, 254-256—mineral resources, 256—Mines and Minerals Ordinance, 257—total gold production, 258—development of railways, *ib.*—amount of rates, 259—receipts, 260—revenue and expenditure, *ib.*—dual position of the Chartered Company, 261—conditions of life, 262—number of schools, 263—efforts to promote education, *ib.*—language question, 264—trade, *ib.*

Richey, Mr., 'Short History of Ireland,' extract from, 425.

Rolin, Henri, 'Les Lois et l'Administration de la Rhodésie,' 254.

Rupee, value of, 470—estimate on the circulation, 473.

Russell, Lord Odo, his letters from Berlin, 310.

S.

Samuelson, Bernard, 'Socialism Rejected,' 208.

Sand, George, 315—publication of the third volume of her biography, *ib.*—period of the Second Empire, 317—style of her writings, 318, 336—characteristics, 319—her method of dealing with life, *ib.*—views on the relation of the sexes, 321—her friendship with Chopin, 322—personal genius and aptitude for dealing with men, *ib.*—presence of mind, 323—conditions attending and following the marriage of her daughter, 323-325, 332—her relations with Musset and Pagello, 324—'Lucrezia Floriani,' 326—her immunity from restrictive instincts, 327—breadth of rendering, *ib.*—'Mademoiselle Merquem,' 328—her mother, 329—the Nohant connections, 330-332—defection of Chopin, 335—letter to her daughter Solange, 337.

Sargant, E. B., 'British Citizenship,' edited by, 3.

Seely, Colonel, at the Cabinet Council, 583—his additional paragraphs to the memorandum, 584—repudiation of his assurance, 586—forced to resign, 587.

Shale oil, production of, 181.

Shaw, G. Bernard, his influence on the German drama, 87—his opinion of S. Butler's writings, 152.

Smith, Garnet, 'The Contemporary German Drama,' 69.

Socialism, views on the character, 204-208.

Stevens, John, his description of the *creaghts*, 98.

Strassburg, history of the Reformation in, 119.

Strikes, risks from, insurance against, 461.

Sturm, Jacob, his influence on the Reformation, 121—friendship with Bucer, *ib.*

Sudermann, 'Ehre,' 74—'Johannes,' 85—his dramatic temperament, 92.

Sykes, F. H., 'Aircraft in War,' 558.

T.

Tagore, Rabindranath, 'Gitanjali,' 232—character of his mysticism, 234—'Sadhana,' 235 *note*—religious views, 235—'The Crescent Moon,' 238 *note*.

Taylor, Sir H., his Autobiography, 296.

Telegraphy, Inter-imperial, 134—importance of an organised system, *ib.*—need of an Imperial council, 135, 151—result of British cables under foreign control, 136-138—proposed Atlantic cable in connexion with Canada, 138—cost of the line, 139—reduction of rates, 140—tariff for deferred messages, 141—Imperial wireless scheme, 142—development of radio-telegraphy, 143—trial of a system, 144—policy of 'equality of opportunity,' 145—under control of the State, *ib.*—relative merits of cable and wireless, 146-151—the Marconi Trans-Atlantic service, 151.

Tennyson, Lord, his lines on letters, 391—on the poems of Gray, 397, 411.

Thompson, Francis, his mysticism, 226—'In no strange land,' *ib.*—publication of his works, 227—'Ecclesiastical Ballads,' 228—his attitude towards inanimate and human beauty, 229—essays on 'Form and Formalism,' 230—'Nature's Immortality,' *ib.*—'Hound of Heaven,' 231.

Thorndike, Ashley H., 'The Maid's Tragedy and Philaster,' edited by, 38—'Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspeare,' 44.

Tovey, Duncan C., 'Gray's Letters,' 392, 398.

Turkey, result of the war with Greece, in 1897, 486.

Tyrrell, George, 'The Church and the Future,' 220.

U.

Ulster, its position, 98—resistance to Home Rule justified, 269.

Ulsterman, The Evolution of the, 96—variety of races, *ib.*—nomadic life of the *creaghts*, 97—position of Ulster, 98—revolution in the land system, 99—flight of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, 100—result of the scheme of the Ulster Plantation, *ib.*—the grant of fixed tenures, 101—difference between the North and South, 102, 114—the Scots settlement, 102—their attachment to Ireland, 103—treatment of the natives, 104—siege of Derry, 105, 107—defeat of James II, 105-107—battle of the Boyne, 107—character of the artisan, 108—development of manufactures, 109—result of the Test Act, and number of emigrants, 110—outbreak of the American War of Independence, *ib.*—religious, agrarian and industrial wrongs, 111—development of the volunteer corps, 112—United Irish movement, 113—failure of the Repeal movement in 1843, 115.

Underhill, Evelyn, 'Mysticism,' 223, 245—'Mystic Way,' 223, 243—her religious views, 244.

Underwriters' Association formed, 454.

Unionist party, their pledge to support Ulster, 270—result of the proposed exclusion, 280-283.

United States, control of British cables, 136.

V.

Vagaries of Recent Political Economy: A Reply and Rejoinder, 174-177. *See* Political.

Vaughan, Henry, cryptic character of his writings, 353—his allegiance to the King, 354—influence of Milton on his poems, 355—'Daphnis,' 356—'The King Disguised,' 358—his Preface to 'Silex Scintillans,' 359, 361—criticisms on Milton's religious views, 362.

Venizélos, E., character of his rule in Greece, 490, 501—initiation of the Balkan League, 491, 501—his lofty conception of patriotism, 495-497.

Villiers, George, 292—his diplomatic career, 293—appointed Minister at Madrid, 293-296—succeeds to the title, 296—his characteristics, *ib.* *See* Clarendon.

Vissering, Dr G., 'On Chinese Currency,' extract from, 472.

W.

Wallis, H. M., 'The Devastation of Macedonia,' 506.

Walpole, Horace, friendship with Gray, 399—character of his letters, 404.

War, Aircraft in, 558. *See* Aircraft.

War, risks of, insurance against, 460.

Ward, Prof. James, 'Heredity and Memory,' 168.

Warren, T. H., 'The Letters of Thomas Gray,' 390.

Webster, Daniel, on the American Revolution, 269.

Whittemore, T., his evidence on the Intercepted Greek Letters, 521.

Widgery, Mr. his Introductory Note to 'Life's Basis and Life's Ideals,' 379.

Wildenbruch, 'Die Karolinger,' 70—'Haubenlerche,' 77—'Meister Balze,' *ib.*—his dramatic temperament, 92.

Wilson, Arthur, 'The History of Great Britain,' 28, 30.

Wilson, Philip, 'The Beginnings of Modern Ireland,' extract from, 430, 431, 440.

Wingfield-Stratford, Esmé, 'The History of English Patriotism,' 196.

Wireless Telegraphy scheme, 142—compared with cables, 146-151.

Wordsworth, W., his 'Sermon on the Sin of Poetic Diction,' 394—criticism of the 'Elegy,' 397.

Wyatt, Horace, and L. M. Meyrick Jones, 'Motor Transport: A National Question,' 178.

Z.

Zwingli, his disputes with Luther, 124—views on the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, 125-127—death, 127.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH VOLUME.

and

of

can

the

ote
als,

70
ster
era-

of

of
30,

The
m,

2—

on
4—

ick
A

er,
of
—



